THE Nation

VOLUME 149 NEW YORK • SATURDAY • JULY 1, 1939 NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 1

EDITORIALS:

STILL USING A THIMBLE 4
THE NEW YORK *Post* CHANGES HANDS 4
LESSONS FROM TIENTSIN 5
WHAT EVERY EDITOR DOESN'T KNOW by Freda Kirchwey 6

FRANCE MEANS BUSINESS by Alexander Werth 7

DELAY MAY BE FATAL by Robert Dell 9

THIS IS AMERICA: III. THE SOUTH STILL LOVES ROOSEVELT by John Temple Graves II 11

"NIEMOLLER OR I" by Albert Viton 13

EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS:
MONTAGU NORMAN'S DUAL ROLE by Keith Hutchison 14

IN THE WIND 16

ISSUES AND MEN by Oswald Garrison Villard 17

BOOKS AND THE ARTS:

THEATER ON THE LEFT—II by Charles R. Walker 18
AN EGYPTIAN MOSES by Alfred B. Kuttner 19
HANDBOOK ON AIR POWER by Eliot Janeway 21
THE GREAT DEFLATOR by I. F. Stone 22
SHORTER NOTICES 22
ART: AMERICAN ART AT THE FAIR by Christopher Lazare 23
FILMS by Franz Hoellering 24
RECORDS by B. H. Haggin 25

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER
Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON
MAXWELL S. STEWART I. F. STONE

Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager
MURIEL C. GRAY

The Shape of Things

*

BRITISH ANGER OVER TIENTSIN HAS RISEN rapidly during the past week as a result of the studied indignities heaped upon local British residents by the Japanese military authorities. The original issue in the controversy, the failure of the British authorities to hand over four Chinese suspects for trial by the Japanese, has long since been lost sight of in what unquestionably has become a bold move to destroy Western prestige in the Far East. Strategically, the Tientsin and Kulangsu blockades appear to be part of a desperate attempt by the Japanese to prevent any supplies from reaching the interior of China. The action against the foreign concessions has been paralleled by the capture of Swatow and the blockade of Ningpo, the two most important of China's remaining ports. What steps Britain will take to preserve the essential rights of its citizens to move about and trade freely is still unclear. Mr. Chamberlain has declared that Japan's "intolerable insults" will have to cease. Hints continue to be made regarding retaliatory action. But despite increasing evidence that some such measures will have to be taken if Britain is to remain in the East, the talk of retaliation has never been specific enough to make much impression on Japanese policy. The situation may have to become even worse before the Chamberlain government takes the most elementary measures of economic self-defense. And worse it seems certain to get.

*

HARD FIGHTING ON THE OUTER MONGOLIAN border is reported to have been going on since May 11. As is usual with such outbreaks, the dispatches from Soviet and Japanese sources are so conflicting that it is impossible to know exactly what has happened. But it is evident that both sides have used airplanes to an unprecedented extent and that losses have been heavy. Previous incidents of this sort—it has been subsequently established—have been instigated in nearly every case by local Japanese commanders. It is quite possible that this one, like the Tientsin blockade, was started by the military clique as a protest against Tokyo's refusal to join the Rome-Berlin military pact. But whatever the

Published weekly and copyright, 1939, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 13, 1897, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause, both this and the Tientsin affair provide powerful arguments for speeding British-Soviet negotiations and for including the Far East in whatever arrangement is ultimately reached. The somewhat belated emphasis which Moscow is putting on the situation is taken as an indication that the Kremlin may be preparing to ask Britain to reconsider its position with regard to the East. Of the two countries, Britain has undoubtedly the most to gain by an all-inclusive alliance.

✶

EVERY DISPATCH FROM EUROPE AND THE Far East indicates that a new climax, if not the decisive one, is at hand in the perpetual crisis the world suffers. More and more observers abroad insist, and they are not merely using a figure of speech, that the Second World War is already under way: that all the reported incidents from Tientsin to Danzig are skirmishes in which the axis powers are testing the peace front; that an outbreak of hostilities on a grand scale is to be expected before fall. The language of both responsible and irresponsible statesmen became less diplomatic over the last week-end. Chamberlain's Cardiff speech, in which he spoke a "last word"—Germany can obtain many things but not by force—and Halifax's message to Ribbentrop—if you want war you can have it—have been answered promptly by Hitler, Goebbels, and Ley with plain war speeches, and more. A propaganda drive has been started in Germany with an entirely new slogan—"Germany's rights or war." This "or war," openly put forward in hundreds of factory and party meetings, while more and more reservists are called to the colors, is a new note. So far Hitler's words, however much his acts have belied them, have been more of peace than of war. Now he seems set upon convincing the German people that they may have to fight after all, that the period of bloodless conquest is over.

✶

JEWS IN GERMANY ARE BEING CALLED BACK to work; immigration permits already issued are being canceled. Their newest fate is to replace workers called to arms—two million in the regular army, four more million in training in various short-time courses. Czech, Slovak, and Austrian workers are being forced into trains and transported as conscript laborers to Germany proper. In Graz wives threw themselves with their children on the railway tracks. Fifty per cent of the Austrian Nazis, who bore the brunt of the fight for *Anschluss* and expected jobs afterward, are in concentration camps for opposing the rule of the "Prussians," who sit now in every warm place. Austrian soldiers, drilled by Prussian officers, complain bitterly of their cruel methods. Officers' quarters have been surrounded with barbed-wire fences for protection. In Bohemia an ever larger police force is necessary to control the Czech opposition. Farmers must have permits to go to the next village. In Germany proper working hours are stretched every week. Families are torn apart. The sons go into the army; the daughters and younger boys are ordered to the country to help with the harvest; fathers returning in the evening from their jobs find an urgent order to appear immediately in a certain place of assembly, where they receive instructions till midnight in the police work which they will have to take over on the "Day." Housewives are left alone to figure out where to get enough food for the next day. They will get handbills instead: "There are people who have a lust for goulash and whipped cream, who want to glut themselves. To every hysterical shouter and belly stuffer who wants to have delicacies, we say this is not the right time." The signs of the terrific strain under which the German population is suffering become more visible every day. The new propaganda drive is apparently designed not only to frighten England and France again—this time with a German war spirit which was absent in the last crisis—but also to overcome the weariness of the German people. As it is, Hitler seems to have reached a height of preparedness which cannot be maintained indefinitely. "Germany's rights or war." The harvest is not far off.

✶

THE SENATE'S SURPRISE ACTION IN ENDING the President's authority to devalue the dollar and in voting an increase in the price paid for domestic silver is of greater political than economic significance. Further devaluation of the dollar was not in prospect; nor were there indications that it would be required in the near future. If it subsequently becomes necessary, Congress can again be asked to grant the President the power it has just refused. Meanwhile, the knowledge that the dollar cannot be raised or lowered in value should have a beneficial effect on foreign trade and may even stimulate foreign lending. Much less defensible was the vote to increase the price of domestic silver from 64.6 to 77.5 cents an ounce. In this action the so-called economy bloc joined with the "lunatic fringe" of money fanatics to sanction a barefaced raid on the Treasury. As has been repeatedly pointed out in these columns, the silver producers are no more entitled to government subsidy than are peanut vendors or any other economic group.

✶

CLOSE ANALYSIS OF THE "INEQUITIES" WHICH a "high Administration official" finds in the proposed amendments to the Social Security Act suggests that the criticism may not be wholly sincere. Objection is made, for example, to the fact that differences of only a few days in birth or a few cents in wages may mean a substantial benefit or none at all. This charge can be leveled

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with equal force against the present law or any system of social insurance which sets hard-and-fast rules for qualification. Similarly, the progressive lowering in survivors' benefits as a result of long-standing unemployment or disability is a minor matter as compared with the decision to extend survivors' protection to the wives and children of the insured. It is also minor as contrasted with the failure of Congress to provide disability insurance as suggested by the Advisory Council on Social Security. An article in next week's issue of *The Nation* will show in some detail how the proposed amendments fall short of providing full security. But it would be most unfortunate if their very real value were obscured by carping criticisms which do not touch the basic issues.

✶

GENERAL FRANCO HAS GRANDIOSE PLANS for reviving the Hispanic Empire of the New World, but it would take a lot of Black Arrow Brigades, Condor Legions, American embargos, and Allied "non-intervention" to bring back the days of the conquistadores. Because Latin America is cool and rapidly growing cooler toward the new regime in the mother country. For this state of affairs three factors are immediately responsible: the appalling number of political executions since the close of the war, the denial of the right of asylum, and the new government's presumptuous approach to the former Spanish possessions of the Western Hemisphere. Even the Mexico City *Ultimas Noticias,* which was pro-Franco throughout the war, finds that the brutality of the fascist regime is losing Franco many friends on this side of the Atlantic, but it is the row with Chile over the right of asylum that has crystallized anti-Franco sentiment. When Spain declined to permit the departure of Loyalist refugees who had found haven in the Chilean embassy in Madrid, the Popular Front government at Santiago won the instant support not only of Mexico, Cuba, and Venezuela, but also of the extremely conservative governments of Uruguay, Salvador, and Argentina. Colombia, which has not yet joined in the protest, is experiencing even more strained relations with the Franco regime. What touched off the explosion at Bogotá was the attempt of Luis Aviles, the new Spanish ambassador, to keep "unfavorable" reports on Spain, especially in connection with the executions, out of the Colombian press. Mass-meetings were held throughout the country, a police guard had to be thrown about the home of the envoy, and newspapers of every political shade reminded Aviles that this was the 129th year of Colombian independence. *El Liberal* as a *coup de grâce* asked whether Señor Aviles could imagine "a Colombian who would enter a Colombian city calling himself 'the Leader' or 'the Victorious' at the head of a legion of foreign invaders."

THE PROPOSAL TO ADMIT 20,000 GERMAN refugee children passed out of the news with the conclusion of hearings before the House and Senate Committees on Immigration; it will be news again when and if it is reported to the floors of Congress. It is at this moment that the pressure of public opinion must be exerted, first, to bring the resolution out of committee and, second, to insure its passage, for the opponents of the measure are working overtime. Their obvious and hostile arguments can be refuted: The bill is not an opening wedge to break down the quota laws—it is avowedly an emergency measure. If it offered any real threat of increasing unemployment the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. would not favor it. The children will not become public charges, for their support will be assured before they enter. The more specious arguments—that the bill will encourage the breaking up of German families, that it discriminates against refugees from other countries, that we must take care of our share-cropper children first, would hardly wring tears even from a crocodile. The most subtle and effective argument is the *sotto voce* contention that this is a Jewish bill. The implication is that all the children are Jewish and—more crocodile tears—that their admission would increase anti-Semitism. Here again the fallacy that Hitler is so anxious to propagate, namely, that the refugee problem is a Jewish problem, is being carefully nurtured. It happens that not more than 60 per cent of the refugee children are of Jewish origin. But even if the percentage were 100, it would still be not a Jewish but a human problem. And if American legislators stoop to ask a child in distress whether or not he is Jewish, we shall have taken a long step in the direction of the anti-Semitism which the opponents of the present resolution so ostentatiously disavow.

✶

ON JUNE 1, 1925, M. PAINLEVE, THE FRENCH Premier, pleaded for reconciliation with Germany, Leon Trotsky was transferred to a new post on the U. S. S. R.'s supreme council, Sinclair Lewis denied calling Americans pigs, snow fell in Wyoming, and Lou Gehrig entered the line-up of the New York Yankees. On May 2, 1939, the French government reaffirmed its pledge to Poland, William Green assailed John L. Lewis, John Barrymore was accused of profane "ad libbing" in Omaha, it was partly cloudy in New York, and Lou Gehrig left the Yankee line-up, suffering, it is now revealed, from hardening of the spinal cord. In the fourteen-year interval Gehrig had played 2,130 consecutive games, shattered innumerable batting marks, and achieved the unique immortality that Americans reserve for their athletic gods. He had also become one of the few fixed elements in the crazy-quilt of present-day civilization. We've often wondered what original insight into human activity Gehrig got from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his lookout at first base, and whether he was conscious of the gap between his own realm, so largely untouched by wars and crises, and the surroundings of ordinary people; how did the advent of the Third Reich appear from a vantage point at first base? Gehrig's fame is a singularly American phenomenon. No other country would salute a man for staying in one place so long, unless he were a statue, and no other populace would be so universally grieved by his ailment. Not only has a superhuman first baseman been transformed overnight into an invalid; an irresistible force has budged one of the few apparently immovable objects of a disordered age.

Still Using a Thimble

THE new spending-lending plan outlined by the President in a letter to Senator James F. Byrnes is a strange mixture of grandiose and halfway measures, long-range insight and short-term opportunism. Its economic weaknesses are its political strength, and its curiously hybrid character is traceable to the peculiar position in which Mr. Roosevelt finds himself. More spending is obviously necessary to provide employment and maintain business at a fair level of activity. The view that industry will revive of its own accord if only the government stands aside is still put forward but not very hopefully in the conservative press. The 1937-38 recession was the result of Mr. Roosevelt's readiness to try that kind of program; the decline in business kept pace with the cut in spending, and expansion was necessary to bring about even a mild revival. Yet a letdown in popular enthusiasm for the New Deal has brought dissatisfaction with "spending"; the growing deficit continues to be a growing political liability. It was necessary to spend without increasing—or seeming to increase—the deficit, and to spend in a way that would be least obnoxious to a Congress in which a Republican and conservative Democratic majority, though unable to put forward a program of its own, is still strong enough to block the New Deal. To meet these exigencies Mr. Roosevelt has framed a proposal that again exhibits his mastery as a political strategist, though it is likely to prove disappointing as an economic prescription.

There is first of all a huge sum total, $3,060,000,000. It may have been hoped that the mere announcement of so huge an expansion in spending would give the markets a reviving fillip. The sluggish reaction of the markets is understandable when one examines the details of the plan. First of all, the plan is a seven-year plan, and the amount to be spent next year is but $870,000,000. Secondly, while the proposal is likely to appease many members of the opposition by leaving projects to be carried out through local initiative and under local control, this factor also means much delay in getting projects started. The President's provision for $100,000,000 in loans for railroad equipment may encounter similar difficulties. The expenditure of even $870,000,000 next year is unlikely. Thus we have Mr. Roosevelt recognizing that government must fill the gap left by private enterprise—but proposing to fill it only feebly. With the policy of pump-priming we have no quarrel. Much of this program —notably the provisions for rural electrification and tenant farm purchases—is admirable. Our principal objection is that Mr. Roosevelt, in this as in past attempts at pump-priming, does not propose to pour enough water down the well really to get the pump started.

The New York "Post" Changes Hands

SALE of the New York *Post* again demonstrates that freedom of the press is nine-tenths rhetoric. Dissident groups enjoy an interstitial liberty. The press is free to criticize politicians as it pleases. Courage comes cheap to conservatives. But the publisher who steps on the toes of Chase National, General Motors, or even Lydia Pinkham must sooner or later bend the knee or be marked for slaughter. Although New York City's numerous liberals and powerfully organized workers would seem a natural market for a progressive, pro-labor daily, the same economic forces that killed the old *Globe* and the *World* have proved too much for one of the country's most enterprising publishers.

The *Post,* made memorable by Hamilton, Leggett, Bryant, Schurz, Godkin, and Villard, had fallen to a low level of mediocrity and conservatism under the Curtis-Martin ownership when it was acquired by J. David Stern in December, 1933. He proceeded to repeat his previous successes in Philadelphia, Camden, and Springfield (Illinois). The paper was never well coordinated, and its performance was always spotty. It stooped to conquer—contests and sensationalism helped build it. But its energetic though often eccentric editorial policies, and its vigorous championing of the New Deal, labor, and the under-dog won it an enthusiastic audience. Circulation had quadrupled when the recession of 1937-38 hit the *Post,* with its inadequate financing and meager advertising, just as it was crawling out of the red. Business difficulties were soon reflected in policies which succeeded only in antagonizing thousands of readers. The *Post's* baiting of reds and the Soviet Union was all the more offensive because of the liberal pretensions of the paper. Regulation of labor unions was advocated. There was an ignominious run-to-cover on Spain. The Apex decision was applauded. Stern's final months as publisher were a frenzied search for funds and a foredoomed attempt to ride as rapidly as possible in two different directions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The paper has now been sold to George Backer, wealthy young American Labor Party leader and B. Charney Vladeck's successor in New York's City Council. Backer has more money, if less experience, than Stern. He also has what Stern never won—the good-will of certain advertisers whose liberalism is tied up with their opposition to Nazism. Portents of a shift back toward the *Post's* earlier liberalism may be seen in Backer's labor-party background, his move away from Stern's isolationism, and the news that he is hiring Rollin Kirby, long unhappy on the pseudo-liberal *World-Telegram,* as cartoonist. The financial fate of the paper will probably be settled by whether or not it gets Macy's advertising; the other stores will follow if Macy's goes in. Advertising may also settle the editorial fate of the *Post.* Whether it does or not will depend only in part on Backer. For the undertow that tugs at newspapers in New York, as in our other cities large and small, is fierce and in the long run irresistible—except (sometimes) by genius, miracle, and luck. We hope that Backer has them all.

Lessons from Tientsin

AS THE Tientsin blockade drags into its third week, the concern of the United States in its outcome has deepened. Too much emphasis, perhaps, should not be placed on the fact that American citizens are suffering serious inconvenience at Tientsin and Amoy as a result of the Japanese action. The local Japanese military authorities have leaned over backward to respect American citizens in the hope that the United States would not join with Britain in drastic action. But it has become increasingly clear that the Japanese themselves see the struggle as broader and more far-reaching than a mere dispute between Britain and Japan. Western interests have proved a real obstacle to their progress in China, and they have determined to crush them if they can.

In a word, Tientsin has shown that the Japanese mean business. Americans with interests in China, whether business, educational, or missionary, can no longer tell themselves that they might be able to carry on as well under Japanese as under Chinese rule. Our government must decide in the immediate future whether it is prepared to defend the rights of its citizens or will relinquish their not inconsiderable interests to the Japanese. Failure to take a firm stand alongside Britain and France in the present crisis would mean surrender to Japan.

No one in this country wishes to get involved in a war with Japan over a conflict of interests in China. There is no immediate danger of such a war. But Britain's experience indicates how weakness and procrastination can lead to an "intolerable" situation. If the Western powers had lived up to their treaty obligations at the time of the conquest of Manchuria, or even at the outset of the present undeclared war, and withheld economic support from Japan, the present crisis could never have developed. If the United States fails to take a stand today, our citizens may tomorrow be suffering indignities that will lead to the inevitable growth of a war spirit.

What strength Japan has today it owes almost entirely to the economic assistance of the United States and the British Empire. These powers furnished Japan with 77 per cent of its imports of essential war materials in 1938. Through absorption of Japanese exports, they provided approximately 70 per cent of the foreign exchange required for the purchase of such necessities. Denied this assistance, Japan, by its own confession, would be unable to carry on in China, much less threaten attacks on the Western nations. But in any economic action to check Japanese aggression, the United States must of necessity play the principal role. Last year this country furnished 57 per cent of Japan's imported war materials, a slightly greater proportion than in the previous year. Its purchases, chiefly because of the amount of silk it takes, are greater than those of any other single country, though the British Empire as a whole takes more.

There can be no question that an overwhelming majority of the American people want to see this partnership with Japan dissolved. A recent Gallup poll taken before the Tientsin crisis showed more than 70 per cent to be in favor of such action. Yet the bitter fact is that Congress will not take up any of the half-dozen embargo bills before it unless popular pressure is exerted to a greater extent than it has been so far. The State Department will not push for action lest it be accused of "pulling Britain's chestnuts out of the fire."

Either the Pittman or the Schwellenbach resolutions would untie the President's hands so that immediate action could be taken to restrain Japan. The Coffee bill, despite its wide support, is too limited in scope. Any bill that is effective is bound to encounter opposition from those profiting from the sale of war materials. Fortunately, no important American interest is involved. Our chief export is cotton, but cotton growers have a special interest in a Chinese victory since one of the announced objectives of the Japanese invasion is the development of a Japanese cotton supply in China. Next in importance is oil, and it so happens that our total sales of petroleum products to Japan are but a small fraction of domestic sales. The powerful iron and steel interests are among the most active supporters of a ban on the export of scrap iron, third on the list of exports. Our chief import is silk, but in rayon, cotton, and nylon we have domestic products which can readily meet all of America's needs. Some sacrifice is undoubtedly involved in the use of economic restraints. But it is as nothing compared with the loss to civilization that would result from a victory for Japanese aggression.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Every Editor Doesn't Know

BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

LIKE many poses, the false air of assurance assumed by even the best of editors is at least expected of them if not forced upon them by their public. I think this is unfortunate—and not only because it ultimately turns editors into prigs, and the journalistic discussion of matters of general interest into pretentious soothsaying. It is chiefly unfortunate because public affairs, today especially, should be approached in a spirit of modest inquiry, proposed solutions should be treated with skepticism, and every opinion should be formed after an honest examination of complicated and conflicting facts. But such an attitude is hard to achieve in the face of the general craving for assurance. No one is going to rush to a newsstand to find out what Westbrook Lippmann doesn't know about the chief events of the day.

Editors take a position. Into that position go such respectable ingredients as thought and acquired fact. Sprinkled in unconsciously are also at least a pinch of class prejudice and political bias and a few grains of self-interest. But the most important influence on the flavor of the final dish is the accumulation of confusion and plain ignorance that has been resolutely skimmed off and thrown away. Down the sink with doubt is too often the motto of our editorial writers, and I do not except those who write the opinions expressed in *The Nation*. One and all we are afraid that the guests may not like our concoctions and won't ask for seconds.

Somewhere editors must find the courage to make room for doubt in their writing. It may even be that our readers will welcome it after a heavy diet of desk-thumping. And especially we must let doubt inform our views on world affairs. Nowhere are we more likely to be betrayed by self-assurance than in the realm of foreign policy: here if anywhere is the place to tread diffidently, watchfully, relying on no precedents or dogmas.

Especially we should be careful about words. Events move, leaving a graveyard of good editorial language behind. Today we may hopefully refer to Mr. Chamberlain's pacts as a "peace front," but we have almost forgotten the larger phrase "collective security," and next month we may be talking about a "war alliance." All three are intended to describe a way of stopping fascist aggression; but a policy that offers hope of a peaceful Europe at one stage may a year later represent the only chance of success in war. If we are wise we will use the inevitable clichés of our trade in full knowledge that they are likely to die in our typewriters. And when they are dead, they should be buried.

Our opinions and hopes and plans are also subject to sudden death. Last year a solid front of non-fascist nations in Europe would probably have been able to deflect or stop altogether the aggressive plans of Hitler and Mussolini. Now even a real peace front might not succeed in doing so. A year ago all immediate steps in American foreign policy could reasonably be calculated in terms of the best way to promote peace. Today it is necessary at least to consider what this nation should do in case of war.

Faced with a choice of evils, doubt is not only permissible; it is obligatory. If war engulfs Europe as it now engulfs Asia, terrific magnetic forces—economic, political, and irrational—will tug at America's neutrality. No artificial isolation will really insulate us against them. It is still true, as it was when collective security meant what it said, that only by preventing war can the United States be kept safe from involvement in war, and now we are not sure that war can be prevented even if Mr. Chamberlain's peace front is built soon and solidly. How long would our neutrality last if war really came? In 1914 we pacifists had a simple slogan; it was "Peace Without Victory." Wilson said it; but we meant it. If war comes now or a year from now, despite our reinforced skepticism about its final effect, our slogan will be different. It will be something like "Stop Hitler" or "Fight Fascism." Can we combine that slogan with a program for keeping America out? Perhaps we can, but I think it is healthy to admit that we don't know that either. In the whole international complex the only facts we can count upon are uncertainty and change. Let us forswear the language and mood of omniscience. They won't work any more.

*

In New York thirty-two years is a generation in the life of a neighborhood as it is in the lives of men. When 20 Vesey Street was built in 1907 to house the *Evening Post* and *The Nation* it was close to the geographical heart of the publishing business. Park Row, just around the corner, was the home of the old *World;* while the *Tribune* and the *Sun,* the *Mail* and the *Globe* were next-door neighbors.

Today the gold dome of the World Building is a bit dingy, and the *World* and the *Mail* and the *Globe* are dead. The *Tribune* swallowed the *Herald* and moved up to the neighborhood of Times Square. The Park Row days are long gone. And now *The Nation* is going, too. It has taken offices at 55 Fifth Avenue, and this week will see the removal of a weekly that has lived in one building as long as the building has stood. Such a tearing-up and replanting is painful even when it seems necessary. Not one member of the staff but will suffer a sense of loss when he looks for the last time at the rooms lately turned into a chaos of packing cases, and at the pleasant outlines of St. Paul's, which through the years have reminded us that America has a past, as well as the present so inexorably condensed into each week's issue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

France Means Business

BY ALEXANDER WERTH

Paris, June 13

AND so Mr. Strang has gone to Moscow, and we are told that it is going to be all right this time. Sir Nevile Henderson, the British ambassador in Berlin, is said to have sent a sort of S. O. S. to London saying that if the Russian alliance was not concluded at once, nothing could stop the Nazis from doing something desperate. Coming from a diplomat who was never known to be prejudiced against the Nazis, his warning is said to have made a big impression on Lord Halifax and even on Mr. Chamberlain; and Mr. Strang has been given a fairly free hand and instructions to get the job finished somehow. The scope for "consultation" is said to have been reduced to very little, and Russia is to be guaranteed not only against a direct attack but also against an "indirect" attack, that is, against one launched via the Baltic states. On the face of it, everything should work all right now. Unfortunately, the Russians have become extremely distrustful after two months of haggling, and the French are not so sure that they will "march." Already the semi-official *Petit Parisien* is putting the blame on the Russians in advance for any possible breakdown by suggesting that all that really interests Stalin is to keep out of war, since war is the only thing that has any chance of breaking up his regime. There may be a fragment of truth in this, but the fact remains that in the opinion of the French government the alliance would have been signed long ago but for the attitude of the British. Why did not the British government accept the general "anti-aggression" formula proposed by the French two months ago as the basis for the tripartite pact—a formula the Russians were ready to accept—instead of concentrating on every variety of "eventuality" in which mutual assistance would work? If a hundred such eventualities were to be set down on paper, the Germans were certain to find a 101st constituting a loophole not covered by mutual assistance. No wonder the Russians grew suspicious.

I really believe that the French government, reflecting public opinion, sincerely wants the Russian alliance and has done its best to get the British government to be sensible. Its policy, especially Daladier's policy—and Daladier *is* the French government today—has been perfectly clear on this issue. There has been no sign in Paris of the hesitations, the muddleheadedness, of the bad old Munich days, when the French government was in a worse state of jitters than even the British; and I think one may say that if the Russian talks break down, the French will not be in any way to blame for it. With no illusions about Russia, the French know that the Germans are working desperately to prevent the Anglo-Franco-Russian alliance, that they have already made use of the present delays to get a foot into the Baltic states—just as they got a foot into Rumania in March, before Britain had guaranteed Rumania—and that they are reckoning, among other things, on the terrific demoralization and discouragement that the breakdown of the Russian talks will cause in all the countries adhering to the peace front. Hardly a single paper of all the thirty-odd papers in Paris today says a single word against the Russian alliance. The *Temps*, which on the day after Munich declared that "the Franco-Soviet pact and the Franco-Polish alliance have lost much of their significance," is today all in favor of it, complete with the fullest guaranties covering "indirect" aggression through the Baltic states.

It is true that Lord Halifax's and Mr. Chamberlain's speeches last week seemed, for a brief moment, to have revived the appeasement chorus in France. It did not, however, burst into song, but chirped rather timidly and self-consciously. The good old *Munichois* suddenly felt that here was a chance for them to make a little noise. M. Flandin, at his jubilee on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his political career, gave a little philosophic twitter about the impossibility of "maintaining the economic status quo in the world, still less in Europe," but the emphasis was cautiously put on the word "economic." On the following day Professor Barthélemy—who in the *Temps* on April 12, 1938, caused such a terrific commotion by saying that the French were not going to fight for the Czechs—came out with a calm, philosophic piece to the effect that "while this hypertension was better than bloodshed" it really could not be allowed to go on indefinitely, and some kind of arrangement should be arrived at with the axis powers. All of this sounded perfectly sound and respectable, except that one could not quite forget what M. Flandin and M. Barthélemy were saying a year ago, or help reading all sorts of funny things between the lines.

M. Marcel Déat, who invented the slogan "Die for Danzig? No!" which sent Daladier into a fury a month ago, and who also proclaimed about the same time that Germany would not keep quiet until it had been given "fresh pastures," was much less discreet than either Flandin or Barthélemy, and put, as the French say, both his feet in his plate by declaring in an article in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAND OF FRIENDSHIP

Oeuvre that all this stuff about the peace front was a lot of ballyhoo, that Germany could easily break it up through the Yugoslav gap, and that even if we signed an alliance with the Soviets nobody could persuade the ordinary Frenchman to fight for Latvia or any other place which he had never heard of and which was not of "vital interest" to him. Will you fight for the Negroes? Will you die for the Czechs? Will you die for Danzig or Latvia? It's funny how in defeatist propaganda the same old tricks are invariably used. It must, however, be said that this sort of thing has, so far at least, not had the slightest effect in France. M. Déat was severely sat on at the French Socialist Congress, which refused to identify itself with his ideas.

One of his severest critics there was M. de Monzie, a member of the present government, who is an interesting French specimen. M. de Monzie is one of those numerous Frenchmen who had absolutely no faith in the Czechs but have an immense faith in the Poles, and who were pro-Munich last year and pro-peace front this year, complete with the Russian alliance. He disliked Benes personally and did not think the Czechs "a nation," least of all a nation capable of any serious resistance; whereas the Poles to him are a real nation, a great nation, the heirs of Kosciusko, and all that. As for the Russians, they may not be a "steam-roller," and their military help may be deliberately limited when it comes to the point, but "we must have them on our side." Altogether, there is very little "Munich" pacifism left in France; even the Paul Fauristes in the Socialist Party represent a traditional intellectual and doctrinaire attitude rather than a widespread movement of opinion in the country, for the man in the street does not believe that Paul Faure's harping on a great international conference for "economic appeasement" is of any practical importance after the reception given in Berlin and Rome to President Roosevelt's message of April 15.

One of the reasons why French opinion is now almost unanimously in favor of the peace front and the Russian alliance is that the right has now abandoned Italy as a forlorn hope. "Our natural ally is not Russia but Italy" was for years the theme of almost every right-wing speech and article. And nothing would discourage them—not the *Anschluss* nor Munich, least of all Italian intervention in Spain. The outcry for "Tunis, Corsica, Nice!" came as a shock to these people, but even that did not fully cure them of the illusion that Italy would sooner or later break up the axis. As recently as the end of March, Bailby in the *Jour* thundered against the idea of the Russian alliance and said that the "natural" alliance against Germany was England-France-Belgium-Holland-Spain-Italy-Yugoslavia-Rumania-Poland. He asserted that the Italians were horrified by the German march into Prague, and that they would gladly enter into such a new alliance. But all this day-dreaming has now been dropped, even by most of the diehards on the right; and although they still dislike a pact with the Soviets, they refrain from saying anything against it. Spain has been a terrible disillusionment to them—and this applies to the French business class. A prominent French industrialist with important interests in Catalonia was asked on the day Barcelona fell whether he was not pleased. "Well," he said, "perhaps my shareholders are going to be pleased, but I don't think France will have much reason to rejoice." When I met him again the other day, he confessed that his shareholders were "thoroughly fed up," too. Another French industrialist told me, in speaking of one of the most famous mining concerns in Spain: "The reds made a dreadful mess of it, but it was mere child's play to what Franco's people have done since." And still another French industrialist went to Spain to inquire about the very important French railway property in the north. He was told that no one could say whether the French-owned railways were going to be nationalized or not, and whether, if they were, any compensation would be paid to the owners.

Nevertheless, illusions about Spain are not quite dead. In spite of everything, Franco is represented as sitting on the fence and as intending to derive every benefit from the battle for influence going on in Spain itself between the axis powers and the others. There is perhaps some truth in the theory that, ultimately, Franco will back the winner, or rather that he will not throw in his lot with the axis powers against a powerfully constituted peace front. But that is the best one can say. It is certainly true that Franco has been impressed by the Anglo-French naval precautions taken in the western Mediterranean and has been complaining of "encirclement"; when Lequerica, the Spanish ambassador at Paris, saw a French minister the other day, this minister said to him: "My dear Ambassador, all that encircles Spain is—the sea." Which was, in fact, a nicely phrased little warning. But while the pressure on Gibraltar and Tangier has relaxed, one cannot be quite certain about anything yet. Can the Balearics be effectively neutralized in case of war? And what of the German submarine bases in the north of Spain? And what are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hundreds of German and Italian airplanes still doing in Spain? None of these questions would arise if the "reds" had not been sunk with the connivance of France, and especially of Britain.

From the French "home front" there is very little to report. Daladier's authority continues unimpaired; and even a very—very—left person I saw the other day said: "He's really making a smart job of it. His ideas on foreign policy are sound, and at home he manages things with a minimum of friction. I think we have been underrating him; or maybe he has himself grown up." Parliament has fallen into terrible disrepute in France, partly through its own fault. The government is accepted as a *salut public* government—which is not contrary to French tradition. As the same very left person remarked to me: "So long as the man in the street is allowed to go on reading his *Canard Enchaîné,* with jokes about the great demonstration organized in Bonnet's honor at Southampton by the solitary railway porter to whom he had given a shilling, he will continue to feel that he lives in a free, democratic country. As for the parliamentary debates, *"Ils s'en font."*

Delay May Be Fatal

BY ROBERT DELL

Geneva, June 14

LORD HALIFAX'S speech in the House of Lords on June 8 sounded very much like an S. O. S. to Hitler to save the British government from the painful necessity of making an alliance with the Soviet Union. The excuse that Halifax's overtures to Germany were necessary to allay German fears of "encirclement" will not bear examination. It may be doubted whether a single German sincerely believes that England and France have the smallest intention of attacking Germany. When the Germans complain, as they did before the war of 1914, that they are being "encircled," they mean that obstacles are being put in the way of their expansion at other people's expense.

The assertion frequently made that Germany is overpopulated and has not sufficient *Lebensraum* is baseless. The density of population at the last censuses in the respective countries was 276 per square kilometer in Belgium, 270 in England and Wales, 252 in Holland, 193 in the United Kingdom, 138 in Italy, 130 in Germany, 90 in Poland, 76 in France, and 72 in Europe as a whole without Russia. Austria, which is now included in Germany, had a density of 80 per square kilometer. I do not know the figures for Bohemia and Moravia, but for all Czechoslovakia it was 108.

Halifax's invitation to Germany, which was supported in speeches by Neville Chamberlain and Sir John Simon, was enthusiastically welcomed by the Italian press, but the German press expressed doubts about its sincerity. In France it caused dismay, and the Paris correspondent of the Manchester *Guardian* said in a message dated June 9: "There is a strong tendency in Paris today not to take Mr. Chamberlain's last statement on the Russian talks and the dispatch of Mr. William Strang to Moscow at their face value, but to treat them rather as so much window-dressing."

One of the most significant comments was that of the pro-fascist *Journal de Genève,* which suggested in an editorial on June 11 that if Hitler at once accepted the offer to negotiate made by the British government, Germany might take the place of the Soviet Union as the ally of England and France. The paper added: "Unless we are greatly mistaken, this is a solution that Mr. Chamberlain would welcome very gladly and that would not be displeasing to British opinion." I am sure that the *Journal de Genève* was right about Chamberlain, but I hope that it was mistaken about British public opinion.

At the time of writing it looks as though Chamberlain and Halifax would be obliged, however unwillingly, to come to an agreement with the Soviet Union. Daladier and his colleagues in the French Cabinet, with the exception no doubt of Georges Bonnet, are now strongly in favor of an alliance of England, France, and Russia, and this is demanded by the French General Staff. Also, it is probable that the Anglo-Turkish alliance would fall through if no alliance were concluded with Russia. Although the agreement between England and Turkey was arrived at on May 12, the treaty has not yet been signed or even initialed, the Turks having postponed its signature pending the Anglo-Russian negotiations.

It may safely be said, however, that, whether or not an agreement is arrived at with Russia, Chamberlain's double-crossing will continue. He has not abandoned the hope of another Munich, and unfortunately a return to the policy of appeasement has a large body of support in the ranks of the Second International and the International Trade Union Federation. It should not be forgotten that the British and French sections of the Second International—the British Labor Party and the French Socialist Party—voted for the ratification of the Munich agreement in the House of Commons and the Chamber of Deputies respectively, and thus became accessories to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the destruction of Czechoslovakia with all its consequences.

Paul Faure, the secretary of the French Socialist Party, who is an ardent *Munichois,* had the support of nearly half the delegates at the recent congress of the party at Nantes, and the absurd resolution adopted by the congress, which was a hash of conflicting policies, declared in favor of an "intenational peace conference." The Men of Munich in the French Socialist Party work with the Men of Munich in the French Trade Union Confederation and with the pro-fascist group led by the ex-Socialist, Marcel Déat.

President Roosevelt's message of April 15 to Hitler and Mussolini is being exploited by the Men of Munich to put on him the responsibility for their policy of peace by further concessions to Hitler and Mussolini. This was done in the resolution of the French Socialist Congress and still more flagrantly in a resolution unanimously adopted on June 7 by the workers' delegates to the International Labor Conference now being held in Geneva, which included the following passage:

> That the working people of every nation strongly urge all governments to join in the international conference suggested by President Roosevelt for an honest investigation into, and constructive solution of, the economic difficulties, social problems, and nationalistic rivalries which already are depriving hundreds of millions of people of their right to enjoy the fruits of civilization, and which, if not peaceably solved, may destroy the innocent people of many nations.

The resolution was proposed by three staunch Men of Munich—the Belgian delegate, Corneille Mertens; the Dutch delegate, E. Kupers; and the Swedish delegate, Gunnar Andersson. Before presenting the resolution to the meeting of the workers' delegates on June 7, they got it approved by Robert J. Watt, the United States delegate, who does not seem to have grasped all its implications. Some of the other delegates do not seem to have realized what they were letting themselves in for by voting for the resolution.

The passage quoted from the resolution is a misrepresentation of Mr. Roosevelt's message of April 15. The misrepresentation was probably unintentional, for I doubt whether any of the delegates had looked up the text of the message. Mr. Roosevelt did not propose such an international conference as is proposed in the resolution. He proposed "discussions," in which the government of the United States would gladly take part, on two specific points, namely, relief from the burden of armaments and "the most practical manner of opening up avenues of international trade." "Discussions" might take the form of a conference but would not necessarily do so. Further, Mr. Roosevelt's proposal was conditional on the consent of Hitler and Mussolini to give certain assurances which they have refused to give. This being the case, the proposal presumably no longer stands.

The resolution of the French Socialist Congress did at least make it a condition of the international conference that the governments taking part in it should be "resolved to respect the engagements freely signed by them"—a condition that excludes Germany and Italy in advance. The resolution of the workers' delegates to the International Labor Conference attaches no condition at all to its proposal of an international conference to bring about the millennium. Apparently, the delegates are prepared to go into a conference with Hitler and Mussolini tomorrow without asking them for any sort of assurance or guaranty that they will abandon their aggressive policies. The fact that the resolution was adopted the day before Halifax's speech was no doubt a coincidence, but it was an unfortunate one. The further fact that the resolution contained no mention of the efforts to form a coalition to resist aggression made it in effect a declaration in favor of an alternative policy. The resolution of the Nantes congress approved those efforts, including the proposed agreement with Russia.

The Geneva resolution of June 7 is unlikely to have much practical effect. Its importance lies in the revelation that it gives of the spirit of too many Second Internationalists. Halifax's speech, on the other hand, was dangerous. It could not fail to increase distrust of the British government, which is already almost universal, and it was calculated to give Hitler and Mussolini the impression that the new policy of Chamberlain and his colleagues is neither sincere nor serious. If the negotiations with Russia are dragged out much longer, Hitler may be encouraged to seize Danzig. The idea that Hitler can be appeased by economic concessions is an illusion. The talk about German lack of raw materials is as big a piece of humbug as the talk about German overpopulation. If Germany lacks raw materials for its peace industries, it is because it spends too much money on preparations for war. Hitler wants raw materials in Europe under his control only to make it easier for him to go to war. In particular, he wants the control of the iron mines of Lorraine and the oil fields of Rumania. The return of the German colonies would not help him, for their supply of raw materials is trivial and would not be available in time of war unless Germany had command of the seas.

As all the diplomatic representatives of the French government have been saying, the only way to avert war is to convince Hitler that he will have war if he continues his aggressions and that he will probably be beaten. The policy of "appeasement" has already brought us to the brink of war, and any sign of weakening on the part of England and France, any encouragement to Hitler to hope for further concessions, may take us over the brink.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This Is America

III. THE SOUTH STILL LOVES ROOSEVELT

BY JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES II

"IF YOU ask me," I heard a well-educated young corporation lawyer in one of the South's industrial centers say the other day, "he's going to run for a third term, and be elected. After that Mrs. Roosevelt is going to be President, and then Jimmie. Me, I'm for General George Van Horn Moseley!" The young man meant it. He honestly believes that the power derived from vastly increased federal funds to spend and innumerable jobs to give is being used to perpetuate Roosevelt, and that the only way out now is to find a man on horseback. He hates the President with a hate that passes Roosevelt-hating in the North, East, or West, and in the service of that hate he is able to endure and to believe much. He can endure what in his lexicon is outright socialism in Republican leaders and conservative Democrats. And he can believe in the nightmares of Messrs. Moseley, Christian, Pelley, Deatherage, and company. He can endure the Ku Klux Klan and Tom Heflin, if necessary, to defeat a New Dealer. He can believe in the great "Jewish international plot" and the impending Communist revolution among Negroes of the South. Hate of Franklin Delano Roosevelt makes all things seem possible. He is vigilante-minded, flog-minded, military-minded, ruling-class-minded, a fascist in fact and sometimes in confession.

The young man gets this detailed mention because there are a great many of him. It is significant that five of the eight "star-spangled fascist" leaders reported upon by Stanley High in his article in the *Saturday Evening Post* last May are located in Southern states. It is significant that twenty-two of the twenty-seven bills against alien radicals introduced in Congress during the present session came from Southern members. And it is significant that the Ku Klux Klan, with fresh cries of "Americanism," has taken unto itself in Atlanta a new Imperial Wizard sworn to follow in Hiram Evans's footsteps. "The fiery cross will blaze again on the hilltops of America," vowed Veterinarian James Arnold Colescott upon assuming the robes in June, "and the Klan will serve militantly for God, country, and home. . . . We shall ever strive to promote the interests of the native-born, white, Protestant, Gentile population of America. Doubtless, the well-organized minority groups will take care of their interests. It is at least their problem." The new Imperial Wizard took care to add that he was "against floggings, lynchings, and intimidations," and promised to do all he could to put people who indulged in these pastimes in the penitentiary.

This is not to say that the South is going, or has gone, fascist. It is simply to report that at a critical time for this part of the country the temperament, history, and circumstance which have so often in the past made certain Southerners feel that sharp measures must be taken to maintain a certain rule are repeating themselves. The young man mentioned above has many friends and much influence, but numerically he is in the minority, and his fascist trend is only one of many currents here.

Other trends may be reported as the South looks to the 1940 elections. One is the advance of organized labor and the slowly increasing acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining by industrialists, a trend which is now limited mainly by bitter-end individualists and the occasional failure of national unions to recognize what most Southerners believe to be regional differences calling for regional policies. The labor movement in the South has profited from the New Deal not only in the Wagner Act but also in the hostility which federal control of wages and hours has aroused in certain quarters and in the quarrel between Mr. Green and Mr. Lewis. Many one-time opponents of collective bargaining have become reconciled to it as an alternative to federal wage-fixing. And Mr. Lewis's Congress of Industrial Organizations and its Textile Workers' Union of America have so awful an affinity to communism in many Southern minds that it has become possible to look with something like affection upon Mr. Green's once-hated American Federation of Labor. Nevertheless, it is Mr. Lewis's organization which has accomplished the most notable new organization—among coal miners and textile workers. On the whole, labor organization in the South is still handicapped by the existence of a huge surplus farm population eager for industrial jobs and by the race problem. To those for whom organized labor is a fearsome thing in any degree, organization of Negroes is especially fearsome. And racial feeling between black and white keeps Jim Crow more or less a member of the union.

Another Southern circumstance influencing 1940 is the voice of science. Thanks in part to the New Deal, in part to the South's own leaders, both physical and social sciences are spreading and are being looked to as the real answer to the problems and opportunities of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

region. The Rust brothers with their cotton-picking machine, Tuskegee's George Washington Carver with his findings in agricultural chemistry, the Farm Chemurgic Council, the late Charles Herty with his research in making newsprint from Southern pine, Frank Cameron, of the University of North Carolina, with experiments in harvesting the cotton plant entire and converting it into cheap cellulose, the new federal laboratory at New Orleans, adventures in making a rubber equivalent out of Southern sugar cane, studies in the production of plastics from cotton hulls and stalks, the development of a tung-oil industry, the substitution of cattle for cotton, the southward march of the cotton-textile and paper industries with promise of more new industries to come, the impetus to soil preservation and erosion control in New Deal agricultural measures—all these and many more developments in physical science have caught Southern imaginations; and even though their effectiveness depends upon a coupling of them with social, economic, educational, and political science—as the Tennessee Valley Authority is attempting to show—they are so much less subject to dispute than the latter that the South's determined emphasis on them makes them a large factor in the present picture.

Vice-President Garner

Another factor is the liberal movement—and the damage done to it by uncomprehending liberals from other parts of the country. The failure of these outside liberals, in their approaches to the South, to separate themselves clearly from a communism which ruling Southerners hate and fear above all else, and their insistence upon a strait-jacket application of general principles without regard to Southern history and circumstance have made their assistance more a liability than an asset to the developing liberal spirit in the South. At the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in Birmingham last December insistence upon a crusade on the spot against local race-segregation laws aroused such bitter resentment and suspicion that hopes of a poll-tax reform and legislative reapportionment, which would have meant something possible and concrete to the liberal cause in Alabama, went overboard. Glorification of the Scottsboro Negroes as individuals was a sentimentality which may have served good purpose in the North, but it hurt the case for plain justice among a people who might have been persuaded of the innocence of the defendants but who knew that, no matter whose the fault, they were individuals of a low order. Trumpeting for every wage increase mentioned in the South and insistence upon arbitrary overnight elimination of the wage differential upon which Southern industry has, rightly or not, been established, may be noble in the abstract, but they harm rather than help efforts for the maximum wage possible without destruction of the operation that gives the wage.

Fascism, union labor, science, liberalism, fear of the Negro—all are contributing to unsolidity in a once solid South. But another factor, related to all and developing over all, is tending to make the South solid again. That factor is the belief in national discrimination against this region. The huge volume on "Southern Regions" prepared by the University of North Carolina's Howard Odum a few years ago is devoted not to this alleged discrimination but to an exposition of phenomena differentiating the South from other parts of the country and suggesting a regional problem and opportunity. But the book has been made a Bible of Southern regionalism, supporting not only the conviction that science and self-help are needed, but also a demand for justice and generosity from the rest of the country. When the President called the South the nation's number one economic problem, he said what Southerners like Dr. Odum had been saying for years. When he was given the hot and hostile retort that the South is really the nation's number one economic opportunity, the answer coincided with what these same Southerners had been saying. The comparative poverty which makes the South a problem, they have been saying, makes it also an opportunity, and calls not only for new effort in the South but for a new national policy. A number one problem is entitled, they are saying, to number one tenderness from tariff makers, number one fairness from makers of freight rates, number one caution in wage-hour-law administration lest there result a destruction rather than an increase of wages, and number one freedom from discriminatory federal and state taxes on cottonseed-oil products. The South is the nation's problem, they are saying, because its poverty deprives the nation of a vast new market for goods and services; its opportunity because the defeat of that poverty would develop that market. The same poverty threatens the nation with an industrial and agricultural competition based on substandards and distress, which can be escaped if Southern economy is lifted to the national level. The spirit of regionalism is so strong today and unites so closely all groups in the South that an effort is on foot to have Southern delegates to the next Democratic National Convention present a solid front, holding their votes subject to bargaining on such matters as freight rates, wages, tariffs, federal taxes. Impracticable as this proposal is, it illustrates a regional consciousness which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is creating a new solidity in the South and which will count in the next Congress if not in the Democratic convention.

It is safe to say that whoever the Democratic nominee may be, the South will vote for him. The Democratic Party still owns this region. Garner can count on it as well as Roosevelt, Farley as well as Hull. Farley would be subjected to an anti-Catholic campaign, but prejudice against his religion might be more than offset by the personal friends he has made on his visits here and by his hold on the party organization. The fact that the Negro vote in the North and East has been won for the Democratic Party in the last two elections and that it may have become more valuable and concession-worthy than the vote of the white man in the South could eventually destroy the South's loyalty to the Democratic Party, but that eventuality is not yet. Once the Democratic nominee is announced next June, he can count on the South.

But there will be sharp maneuvers and bitter infighting before the nomination is made. Encouraged by the failure of the "purges" in South Carolina and Georgia and by the national rightward trend in the 1938 elections, anti-Roosevelt elements are out to make Southern votes at the convention decisive not only against a third-term nomination but against nomination of any New Dealer. John Garner is their man. They prefer him to Cordell Hull because many of them are industrialists and do not like the tariff-leveling policies of the Secretary of State. Lately, however, there has been much editorial doubt of Garner's ability to get the nomination. In spite of his showing in Gallup and other polls, belief is growing that no one who is not at least acceptable to Roosevelt can be named. The anti-Roosevelt Charlotte *Observer* has announced editorially that there is "no chance for 'Cactus Jack'" at the convention, and the Columbia *State* thinks that "he has a slim chance for the nomination, and a much slimmer chance to win if he gets it," since the country's conservative vote will go Republican. Next to Roosevelt, Garner and Hull are favorites in sample votes throughout the South, but Paul McNutt may grow in popularity with those who want Garner but think he can't win.

Voting restrictions which deny the Southern masses their full voice give the anti-Roosevelt movement an advantage beyond its popular strength in the South. In spite of this, the popularity of Roosevelt is still so great that he has only to announce for a third term to be sure of nearly every Southern delegation. Any other New Dealer will have hard sledding, but the President needs only to ask to be given. Undoubtedly this situation in the South will be a factor in his decision. It isn't that the South condones violation of the third-term tradition, or is altogether satisfied with the New Deal—the price of cotton is an argument against that. It is simply that the Southern masses have come to include Roosevelt in their tradition as they include the Democratic Party itself. No matter what failures attend his efforts to restore cotton's kingdom, no matter how wrong he may be on purges, court packings, third terms, and the like, he is their man; they believe in his good intentions; they suspect his enemies; and they will not turn him down even though they may deny him his objectives.

In the South as elsewhere Roosevelt has won friends with his foreign policy among those who oppose his domestic policies. Isolation has its innumerable champions, but a region which once sent more than half its cotton and tobacco abroad and hopes to do so again—and which learned through party loyalty to Woodrow Wilson to accept international action—finds it easier to believe that peace and prosperity lie in the direction taken by the President, in his overtures both as a peacemaker and as a maker of balances in international power politics. There is wide conviction in the South at this writing that the Roosevelt policy has stopped the dictators. There is a feeling, too, that as White House and Hyde Park hosts to George and Elizabeth, the President and Mrs. Roosevelt were just about perfect.

The South, it may be said, is looking right, left, up, down, and over—but it still loves Roosevelt.

[*The fourth article of this series, on the Southwestern states, will appear week after next.*]

"Niemöller or I"

BY ALBERT VITON

RELIGIOUS and anti-fascist forces in this country should join their counterparts in the Reich this week in marking the beginning of Dr. Martin Niemöller's third year of martyrdom in Nazi prisons and concentration camps. Niemöller's arrest on July 1, 1937, on Hitler's personal order came as a surprise to no one, least of all to himself. In a sermon he had delivered a few days before as the sole member of the Prussian Council of the Confessional Church still at liberty, he had attacked the fundamental principles of the regime with unprecedented vigor. An emergency court released him early in 1938 after he had served eight months in the notorious Moabit Prison. But even before he could see the friends who were waiting for him outside the courtroom, he was seized by Gestapo agents and lodged in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp.

In the Third Reich and outside Dr. Niemöller has become the symbol of the defense in the relentless *Kulturkampf* now being fought in Germany. In a private letter recently received in this country an Evangelical pastor writes that "not since the days of the Roman Empire have Christians suffered such persecution as now under so-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called Christian rulers." No exact statistics are available on the number of churches confiscated for neo-pagan worship, nor can one say how many pastors are under arrest. But at least a hundred have been deprived of office, more than forty have been prohibited from entering their parishes, at least forty others have been forbidden to preach, and many have had their salaries confiscated. The Bible may no longer be displayed in bookstore windows, and efforts are not spared to put an end to the publication of religious tracts.

The Nazis are now directing most of their energies toward uprooting Christianity among the youth. *Sigrune: Organ for Nordic Art* recently published a photograph of boys and girls in Hitler Youth uniforms performing a pagan puberty ceremony which is to replace communion and confirmation. Publication of the periodical *Evangelical Youth* has been prohibited. *Schwarze Korps,* official organ of the S. S., on June 6 started publishing a "National Socialist Catechism" to uproot "a whole series of Christian ideas" which "cannot be coordinated with the national philosophy." The grammar schools of Kirchheim have instituted a special course in the Nazi catechism; the *Schwarze Korps* now demands that all schools be compelled to substitute the new catechism for the Christian, because, if both are taught, children "will learn in one hour things which they should deny in the next." Pressure is being brought on university students not to study theology. Dr. Heinz Franz, one of the official Nazi student leaders, demanded in May that all theological scholarships and stipends be discontinued; the German Student Association at the Martin Luther University at Halle ordered the expulsion of all theological students from membership; the Evangelical seminary at Bethel, directed by Bishop von Bodelschwingh, has been ordered closed.

But the opposition forces are not meekly submitting to these and other draconic measures. The first public mass demonstration against the regime was staged recently in Dahlem, Niemöller's parish. All the 115 demonstrators were arrested. Dahlem again defied the Nazis on June 13, when 2,000 protested against the decision to deprive Niemöller of his office. An American theologian just back from a visit in the Reich personally witnessed numerous acts of defiance in provincial towns and villages. He saw the heroism of an Evangelical pastor and his community defeat Nazi efforts to take possession of a church; he saw theological students resist with force a group of Nazi trouble-makers; above all, he saw police making common cause with an Evangelical pastor against Nazis who had come in buses to disturb a Sunday service.

When Dr. Schacht, former Foreign Minister Baron von Neurath, Finance Minister Count Lutz Schwerin von Krosigk, and Minister of Justice Traug Gürtner appealed for Niemöller's release in the spring of 1938, Hitler is reported to have replied, "It is Niemöller or I." That challenge has been taken up. Religious people who attempted to come to terms with the regime are now compelled to acknowledge the hopelessness of their efforts. In increasing numbers they are forging a united front with other opposition groups. The secret "German Freedom Party" has found many adherents among them. The new opposition is directed not only against specific acts of the regime but even more against its whole spirit as expressed in the total denial of freedom of conscience, the November pogrom and the merciless enforcement of the Aryan paragraph, the attempts to convert the church into a propaganda department of the Nazi Party, and the distortion of the New Testament to eliminate among other things all references to the virgin birth of Christ, Jews, sin, grace, and life everlasting. No doubt it would be dangerous to overestimate the menace which this opposition constitutes to the regime. Weapons are obviously unevenly divided. But it would be equally dangerous to dismiss it lightly. Human conscience can be an explosive force.

Everybody's Business

Montagu Norman's Dual Role

London, June 13

CONFRONTED by all too obvious prospects of aggression, the Czech government some time prior to Munich prudently decided to remove a part of its banking funds from Prague. Some of its gold and foreign-exchange reserves it placed with the Bank of England; it also deposited gold bullion amounting to some $30,000,000 with the Bank of International Settlements at Basle. In taking this latter step it was perhaps influenced by the very special position of the B. I. S. in international law. Under protocols signed by the leading European powers in 1930 and 1936, this bank was, in the words of Sir John Simon, given "complete immunity from all forms of restriction and interference"—an immunity which applied both to property and assets owned by the bank and to property and assets which it held for others. The intention of this provision was to give sanctuary to the funds of the B. I. S. wherever deposited and protect the assets of neutrals in countries at war.

The B. I. S. has no vaults of its own, and when it received the deposit of Czech gold it handed it on to the Bank of England for safekeeping. Naturally the Czech government did not object. "Safe as the Bank of England" is a British slogan which has gained world currency and is one of the cornerstones of London's position as an international financial center. Hence when Hitler marched into Prague on March 15, the Czechs may have drawn some consolation from the fact that at least a part of their liquid assets was beyond the invader's reach. Moreover, the British government almost immediately took steps to block all Czech funds in England and prevent their passing into German hands.

The Nazis' greed for gold was not to be so easily balked. In Prague their first move was to occupy the National Bank,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and they immediately set to work to gain control of Czech deposits with the B. I. S. According to the *Week*, a London "news letter" which is usually well informed, an order to transfer the $30,000,000 gold to German account was presented on March 17. Whether this order was signed by authorized directors of the Czech National Bank, who clearly would be acting under duress, or by new directors hastily and illegally appointed by the German government, is not yet known. But in any case the B. I. S. executive, apparently without consulting the Board of Directors, immediately decided to honor the order and in turn instructed the Bank of England to release the gold.

Presumably nobody in the Bank of England was capable of adding two and two. It was known that the British government was anxious to obtain details of all Czech assets in London, but although the Treasury and the Bank of England are in constant consultation not a hint was passed to the former. The bank took the position that its sole duty was to obey the instructions of the customer in whose name the gold was held. As Governor of the Bank of England, Montagu Norman was not aware that the B. I. S. in this case was simply acting as trustee for the Czech National Bank. As director of the B. I. S. he was, no doubt, better informed, but did not choose to pass on his knowledge to his other self.

This singular transaction only became public knowledge toward the end of May when it was subjected to indignant criticism in Parliament by members of all parties. Their wrath was at first directed against the government, which seemed now to be engaging in financial "appeasement." Sir John Simon, Chancellor of the Exchequer, appeared for the defense. The Treasury, he declared, had no inkling of the affair until toward the end of March, when partial information reached it from an indirect source. Having received such a tip, it might be thought that it would have made a few inquiries of its own; but the National Government has always shown a positive genius for being unaware of embarrassing facts—its blissful ignorance about the extent of Italian intervention in Spain is an example—and it seems to have done nothing at all. According to Sir John Simon, there was nothing it could do unless it treated B. I. S. protocols as scraps of paper, which would have been contrary to international law and morality. The responsibility, he insisted, was solely that of the B. I. S.: once it had given an order, the Bank of England had no option but to obey it, and the government was bound not to interfere. Nor were the British directors of the B. I. S. under the control of the government. The B. I. S. was a non-political body, and the British members of its board were representatives of the Bank of England, which was the government's banker but not a government bank.

Since Simon thus passed the buck to Basle, it is worth while to examine more closely the composition of the B. I. S. directorate, made up of appointees of the chief central banks which participated in its formation. There are three French and three German bankers, two British, two Italian, two Japanese, two Belgians, and one Dutchman, one Swede, and one Swiss. It can be safely assumed that the Germans, Italians, and Japanese are strictly subject to the orders of their governments and on major questions probably vote together. In order to obtain a majority they would only need to win over two others, and since there are many indications that Montagu Norman has long been *gleichgeschaltet*, they no doubt can usually count on their British colleagues. This would explain the willingness of the Nazi government, despite its hatred of everything international, to continue participation in the B. I. S.

In this instance the actual decision is supposed to have been made by the executive committee, which is composed of Dr. Beyen, the Dutch president, M. Auboin, the French general manager, and Herr Hechler, the German assistant general manager. Today's *Financial News*, in a report by a special correspondent in Basle, states that Dr. Beyen supported his German colleague against the strong opposition of M. Auboin. The latter informed the French government, which suggested that the whole matter be submitted to the board. But the French directors declared that they would certainly be outvoted in this case, and this opinion was confirmed by inquiries made in London. As a result the whole affair was left to the executive committee. If this account is substantially correct, it would seem that Montagu Norman and Sir Otto Niemeyer, the British directors, though they were not consulted officially, were perfectly aware of what was going on and, by silence, gave their consent. The June meeting of the board at Basle is known to have been devoted mainly to the question of the Czech gold. No statement was issued and no action taken. The only possible inference is that the board has condoned and confirmed the action of the executive.

Inspired apologists assert that in accordance with Swiss law the B. I. S. was bound to comply with instructions from the Czech National Bank so long as the signatures were in order. But it is a general banking principle, and one, I understand, incorporated in the Swiss code, that a banker who surrenders funds belonging to a customer when he has reason to suspect irregularity is guilty of negligence. In this instance it was a notorious fact that the Czech National Bank had just been seized in violation of all international law, and it was a reasonable inference that its directors were acting under *force majeure*. Ought not the B. I. S., therefore, to have sought the direction of the courts before surrendering the gold? That, I believe, prudent bankers will agree would have been the correct course of action, even though it might have been extremely embarrassing to the German government to call the Czech directors as witnesses to the authenticity of their signatures.

While the B. I. S. was Germany's chief accomplice in this crime, the Bank of England can be charged with having been an accessory after the fact. Its defenders claim that had it refused to execute immediately the order from the B. I. S., it would have violated the spirit if not the letter of the protocols. But as a speaker in the parliamentary debate pointed out, if a banker knows that the holder of an account acts merely as trustee for a third party, and has reason to believe that the trust is being abused, it is his duty to make inquiries and, if in doubt, withhold payment until the legal position is established. During the Spanish civil war funds belonging to the Bank of Spain were blocked on far flimsier grounds.

The Bank of England's willingness to compound this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

felony must tend to weaken London's prestige as a financial center. Small countries subject to German aggression will more than ever prefer to keep their funds in New York. Aside from this, Britain is directly damaged in two ways. With the removal of these $30,000,000 the remaining Czech assets in this country are insufficient to meet all the British claims against them. Worse still is the contribution which has been made to the financing of German rearmament at a time when this country is being forced to take extraordinary measures to resist German aggression.

After this incident there is a strong feeling in financial and political circles here that the B. I. S. should be wound up. It was originally founded largely to facilitate the payment of reparations. This function has disappeared, and its usefulness as a safe haven for the reserves of the smaller central banks can hardly survive the gross breach of trust it has just committed. It will, indeed, be surprising if those depositors who have the misfortune to be near neighbors of the Reich do not close their accounts as soon as possible. Some of its champions claim, however, that it still has a role to play as a "Central Bankers' Club." Seeing the assortment of weapons already at Germany's disposal it will occur to many that such a "club" is clearly superfluous.

KEITH HUTCHISON

In the Wind

IN THE London office of the Chicago *Tribune* is a board bearing in gilt letters the names of distinguished ex-members of the staff. A gap indicates that one name has been removed. It was that of George Seldes, expunged on direct order from Colonel McCormick.

TWO ARAB chiefs were arrested recently in Damascus, where they had been engaged in violent anti-British agitation. Police searched them and discovered that each prisoner was carrying a large packet of Bank of England notes. Investigation revealed that the notes were part of a consignment recently sold to the Banco di Roma by the Bank of England.

THE RAILROAD exhibit at the World's Fair includes a wall display indicating on maps the costs of freight transportation in various European countries. The map of Italy, clearly outlined, includes the island of Corsica.

RECENT REPORTS of a Vatican-sponsored "appeasement" move created a major disturbance in high French circles. Although newspapers didn't report the incident, it is said that five members of the French general staff formally told the government that they would "no longer be responsible" for France's safety if another Munich were engineered.

A GROUP OF English-speaking Catholics met in Madrid several weeks ago and drafted a joint letter to the Primate of Spain. The letter expressed glowing enthusiasm for "Catholic Spain" and hailed its triumph over "the red enemies of Christian civilization." Among the signers was William Carney, New York *Times* correspondent in Spain.

A NEWSPAPER being planned for New York will have as its front page a table of contents written in headline form. . . . The next big Dies committee attack will probably be aimed at Hollywood liberals. . . . H. L. Mencken wants migratory workers deported to Russia. . . . *America,* the Jesuit weekly, now brackets Chile with Mexico as a "red" country. . . . Only four minor stations of Chicago's sixteen radio stations will sell time to the Guild strikers against Hearst. . . . A headline in the Chicago *Tribune* ran: "Spain Abolishes Capitalism; Puts Limit on Profits." . . . In pre-axis days Japanese stores used to sell "Russian cakes" for five sen each; now they are called "Italian cakes" and cost six sen.

ALTHOUGH NEWS of these actions rarely reaches the cables, "slow-down" demonstrations by German workers are having their effect. A pronounced example is the situation in the Ruhr coal mines. In May, 1928, 275,000 workers employed there produced an average daily output of 420,000 tons. In May, 1939, according to figures recently revealed in Germany, 311,000 workers averaged 419,000 tons a day.

THE RELUCTANCE of newspapers and public officials to reveal the suicides of famous people is notorious. There is usually an elaborate explanation of the "sudden death," then a long silence. The latest example is a press-association dispatch about a Western judge. The dispatch said that he had "suffered chronic pain from a stiff neck. Stretching his neck afforded him some measure of relief. His body was found yesterday dangling from a strap in a fuel shed behind his home. A coroner's jury returned a verdict that death was due to 'strangulation while attempting treatment for a stiff neck.' "

FATHER COUGHLIN'S New York followers recently staged a quick reversal. A fortnight ago *Social Justice* trumpeted the charge "Jews Boycott Hearst," blamed Hearst's financial troubles on Jewish opposition, and urged Catholics to read his papers. The following week Hearst's New York radio outlet, WINS, rescinded its agreement to put Father Coughlin's speeches on the air. Now Coughlinites are picketing Hearst's WINS.

A NEW rare item for stamp collectors is the result of recent diplomatic moves. When the French government recently issued a stamp carrying the picture of Clemenceau, the German government protested. The stamp was abruptly withdrawn and is now being offered at a high price.

GERMANY'S MINISTRY OF WAR is quietly organizing courses for military officials in various foreign languages. Among the subjects included is Yiddish, apparently on the theory that invasion of Poland and Rumania will bring officials into contact with large numbers of Yiddish-speaking Jews.

[*We invite readers to submit material for In the Wind. The $5 prize for the best item received in June goes to Charles Davis of Wheeling, West Virginia, for the story about the patent-medicine advertisement published two weeks ago.*—EDITORS THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

THE liberalism of the Roosevelt Administration and of Mr. Roosevelt himself is likely to face a severe test in the next few weeks. For Congress has before it a number of reactionary anti-alien and anti-immigration bills: it has already passed what is really a federal criminal-syndicalism law, and the Senate Judiciary Committee is at this writing considering a measure which would confine certain aliens in a concentration camp without trial, indefinitely, if they could not be returned to the country of their origin. This Hobbs bill was actually passed in the House by a vote of 290 to 61. If it is passed by the Senate, only a Presidential veto will save the country from this long step toward fascism. Most of these bills are totally unnecessary to protect the country from those who would overthrow the government by force from either right or left. All of them constitute grave breaks with our historic principles and beliefs. Arising in most cases from a genuine desire, which every loyal citizen must share, to protect our own institutions, they carry within them the seeds of destruction.

Personally I have the greatest hope that the President will not permit such laws to become effective. But I am not too sure, for he has been singularly silent about many infractions of our civil liberties. Only once or twice has he even referred to them. Never has he made such forthright statements as those that have come, animated with the finest American spirit, from the lips of Secretary Ickes and, more lately, from our admirable Attorney General, Frank Murphy. The latter has just taken a wonderful step forward by creating a civil-liberties division in the Department of Justice and putting at the head of it a subordinate who really believes in our liberties and means business. Not in fifty years has there been as important a development in this department, which during the war and post-war years, under Woodrow Wilson and Attorney General Palmer, was a department of injustice and a national disgrace. I give the President full credit for having made possible this move by Attorney General Murphy. But he has rarely exercised his veto, and he may easily yield to the clamor for measures that Congress seems bent on passing unless it is made absolutely clear to him that the bulk of the American people are opposed to them and do not intend to have the country stampeded into them.

There is no worse adviser for the country than Senator Reynolds; yet we are likely to see the Senate seriously considering his anti-alien bills, somewhat modified. Perhaps before these words appear in print, bills will be reported to the Senate providing for registration of all aliens, for compulsory naturalization of all aliens one year after arrival, for the complete stoppage of immigration for five years, with resumption at that time only if it is certified that there are less than 5,000,000 unemployed in the country. The Senate Immigration Committee has already appointed a subcommittee to consider the Dempsey bill, passed by the House, to gag labor, religious, and other progressive organizations by making their non-citizen members deportable if the organizations should take formal action on political matters affecting the government. These bills are so loosely drawn, I believe, that they could be used to punish persons belonging to organizations engaged in perfectly legitimate propaganda to alter governmental bureaus and departments.

Eager as I am to safeguard the country from the machinations of the Nazis and their fascist sympathizers, it seems to me that these bills must be defeated at all costs. So I add my appeal to those that are going out from liberal societies and publications and other defenders of our civil liberties, and ask everyone who sees these lines to write to his Senators and his Representative in protest, and to hold himself in readiness to take part in a nation-wide demonstration to the President if that becomes necessary. Not only should we permit immigration to continue as at present, but we should let down the bars to take in 20,000 child refugees, as the Wagner-Rogers Child Refugee bill would have us do. For us to stop immigration now would debar this government from going on with its efforts to induce other nations to make room for the victims of the German despot.

The President took the lead in calling the Evian conference to deal with these victims of Hitler. How can we continue in this great humanitarian enterprise if we close our own doors to them? Nothing could be more cruel and cold-hearted; nothing would be a greater break with our historic policies. We have been from the foundation of our Republic a place of refuge from oppression. Millions of our inhabitants are the descendants of refugees. To shut out those who are fleeing from Europe in this terrible moment in the world's history would be nothing short of a crime. Should the Roosevelt Administration permit it no one could claim that it was a really liberal government or one true to the finest traditions of our American life.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

THEATER ON THE LEFT

BY CHARLES R. WALKER

II

IT IS admitted—and in certain circles acutely resented—that in a brief three years and a half Uncle Sam has become the greatest producer in the world. With a taste both daring and catholic, the Federal Theater has lifted plays out of the whole dramatic canon of the race, beginning with Euripides and ending with Shaw, including Broadway successes, vaudeville, marionettes, a circus, and a show boat. Playing in thirty-five states, with the admission price usually from 5 to 55 cents, it has attracted an audience totaling 26,000,000, 65 per cent of whom, according to Hallie Flanagan, had never seen a "legit" before in their lives. Of this vast project, the present article will deal with but a single aspect—the relation of the WPA theater to left and social drama.

More than a year ago *Fortune* declared, "From any point of view save that of the old-line box-office critics . . . the Federal Theater Project is a roaring success." But it has *not* been a success with evangelistic opponents of the Administration—who feel that the taxpayers' money has not only been wasted but at times been spent to spread the germs of communism in America. When "The Revolt of the Beavers," a class-struggle parable, appeared, one New York reviewer suggested that Sovietism was being taught by the Federal Theater to American school children. The review was instantly photostated, and within twenty-four hours a copy was on the desk of every United States Senator.

The following plays are generally considered the most provocatively left of FTP's productions: "Turpentine," a play about Negro workers in their relations to their white bosses; "Chalk Dust," which dealt with teachers and the educational system; "Class of 1929," a play about young men on relief; "The Cradle Will Rock," class struggle in the steel mills in operetta form (this play, originally sponsored, then denied sets and stage hands, by FTP, was later taken under the wing of the Mercury—after a successful run on its own); "It Can't Happen Here," a doubtful left play portraying what fascism would look like in America according to Sinclair Lewis—it implied strong defense of old-fashioned Americanism and was careful not to offer any radical alternative; "Help Yourself," a farcical kidding of bankers and big business; "The Revolt of the Beavers," mentioned above; "The Living Newspaper"—"Triple A Plowed Under," "Injunction Granted," "News of 1935," "One Third of a Nation," "Power." Other districts outside New York have contrived their own "Living Newspapers." Chicago, for example, last season did "Spirokete," popularizing the menace and cure of syphilis.

FTP affirms, and audience records bear it out, that it has produced social plays—as it has produced Shakespeare—because the public demanded them. It is this fact and not FTP sponsorship that should really give the *Saturday Evening Post* pause, if it insists on the jitters. Of a typical FTP audience Richard Lockridge wrote: "It is young, lively, and I suspect hard-up. It goes to the theater only partly to pass the time. It goes evidently expecting to hear something said." The "something" can be gathered from a study of the preceding list and a score of other provocative offerings. An English observer who wrote a book on FTP insists: "Not only have the best of the Federal Theater productions expressed a definite viewpoint, *it seems their excellence is on the whole in direct ratio to such expression.* Clearly what is needed in that good 55-cent playwright is a clear propagandist." (Italics mine.)

Possibly FTP's most distinctive and finished innovation, aesthetic or otherwise, was the "Living Newspaper." Being, so to speak, open propaganda openly arrived at, its conscious frankness contributed a purity of form and intention, an absence of artificiality, and a punch lacking in all but a few other examples of propaganda drama. Plays like Albert Bein's "Let Freedom Ring" or Lawson's "Marching Song" strike one, in contrast, as impure amalgams of aesthetic feeling and social thesis.

Timing and tempo were of the essence, so much so that there was almost a symphonic quality about certain ensembles in "Power" and "One Third of a Nation." There were reminiscences of the technique of the old agit-prop at its best, and also of the chorus interludes of "Peace on Earth," but the scripts were far sharper and more factual, and a direction emerged that was flexible and mature. The very limitations of the themes chosen elicited not only a careful documentation but a dramatic ingenuity lacking in earlier and freer propaganda groups.

The Federal Theater Project, vast as it is, has by no means preempted the field of the social theater. If many social-minded and talented persons were absorbed from other groups when the WPA started, hundreds were later dropped for lack of funds or returned to jobs in the regular theater. Distinguished examples are of course

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marc Blitzstein ("Cradle Will Rock") and Welles and Housman of the Mercury, who were responsible for FTP's Negro "Macbeth" and "Faustus." In the catastrophic contingency of a collapse of the Federal Theater Project the nucleii for a renascent and independent theater in America would be legion.

Though FTP is worthy of acclaim by all believers in a "free adult theater" it would be a mistake to overlook certain limitations and dangers inherent in any state-subsidized theater. In spite of the absence of formal censorship, limitations have inevitably been imposed, first, by the general objectives of the Administration—reforming capitalism and defending it—and, secondly, by the directives of the Communist Party, which has organized the largest bloc of left opinion inside the FTP. The fact that recently the immediate objectives of the Administration and of the Communist Party have coincided has constituted a kind of double check on the character and scope of left criticism permissible in WPA drama. It is easy to imagine a whole category of plays subject to this double check: any play, for instance, that sharply portrayed the democracies—England, France, and the United States—as defenders today of capitalist imperialism rather than as potential allies in a crusading war against fascism, or any play critical of Washington *from the left* and advocating a "revolutionary way out of the crisis of capitalism," as many left plays of the early thirties did. All this, in the writer's opinion, quite apart from the merits of the political questions involved, is an argument for a flourishing "free and adult" social theater *outside* the federal project.

But within the limits set by this double check the freedom and vitality of FTP's social theater, as I have emphasized, have been astonishing. As far as I am aware, they would be endangered only by a world war or a turn to the right in Washington, or in the administration of the Federal Theater itself.

What would have happened, for example, to "Injunction Granted," or "The Revolt of the Beavers," or "Power" in war time? Since social criticism is notoriously incompatible with mobilizing a modern nation for war, they would never have been produced. On the other hand, if the Federal Theater Project should be still alive when war comes, it would presumably serve the War Department as a propaganda arm—and far more effectively than the commercial theater itself.

Of more pressing interest, one hopes, is the future of FTP in peace time. It was disturbing a year ago to find lots of evidence of a relative dampening down originating in Washington. Certain workers in the New York project, at least, believed that those in control were no longer seeking for plays that "say something" but for plays that "say little" as innocuously as possible. Last year George Kondolf replaced Philip Barber as head of the New York theater project. He was energetic and devoted, but a rumor persisted that he was appointed in order to make FTP in New York "safe" for the Administration. Whether or not that was true, it is easy to see why social-minded audiences thought so. "One Third of a Nation" was produced and indeed in part directed by Mr. Kondolf, but the play was an inheritance from Mr. Barber's administration. "Haiti," though based on the stirring story of Christophe's revolutionary resistance to Napoleon, turned out to be the old familiar miscegenation melodrama. Rex Ingraham and the rest of the Negro cast, as well as the theme itself, deserved better treatment at the hands of WPA. "Prologue to Glory," a play about Lincoln's youth, was socially quite innocuous, and both script and production were unbelievably dull. The only play in the repertory with punch was one contributed from England by Mr. Shaw. "On the Rocks" had enough of Shaw in it to make it worth seeing, though it was difficult when the curtain came down to decide whether the author had been advocating a Fascist dictatorship or a Communist one.

This year there have been signs of renewed vitality. Under attack and working against odds, FTP has continued to be one of the soundest cultural and social assets of America. The politicians who want to destroy it in the name of economy or the "American way" would do well to take a plebiscite of the 30,000,000 Americans who constitute its audience. The season has given us, among other things, "The Blow," a pleasant and highly successful melodrama about a hurricane, and the irreverant and lively "Swing Mikado." (See without fail "Pins and Needles'" hilarious parody, "The Red Mikado," inspired by it.) But above all, "Life and Death of an American" by George Sklar—which contrasts favorably with Messrs. Kaufman and Hart's boy-scout version of American civilization in "The American Way"—proves that FTP as a social theater isn't dead.

One calls to mind the remark made two years ago by Hallie Flanagan to the American Theater Council: "The theater when it is good is always dangerous."

[*The first half of this article was printed last week.*]

BOOKS

An Egyptian Moses

MOSES AND MONOTHEISM. By Sigmund Freud. Alfred A. Knopf. $3.

FREUD'S much-heralded book is neither a psychoanalysis of the Bible nor primarily an attack upon the Catholic church. Indeed, as far as the church is concerned, Freud, who has had to live under its dubious aegis most of his life and has been told that psychoanalysis was merely an extension of the confessional technique without benefit of clergy, has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paid it a belated compliment. He notes that during the recent barbarian invasion of Austria it was Catholicism which rose to the defense of culture and decency.

The book contains many things, however, which will be unpalatable to many minds and denominations. Not that this is likely to astonish the author; from a lifelong experience of hostility to his theories he would probably suspect something seriously amiss if a book of his were not repudiated in many quarters. And in this case the challenge is particularly grave. In brief, Freud claims that Moses was not a Jew but an Egyptian, that the still barbarous and polytheistic tribes of Israel at the period of the Exodus could not have been the originators of an enlightened monotheism, and that Moses was slain by a cabal of reactionary priests who resented his innovations. He further asserts that Christianity, as formalized by the priestly hierarchy during the centuries following Christ's inspired credo, was a distinct recession from the spiritualized, ethical emphasis of the Jewish religion, which had gradually discarded the trappings of magic, superstition, demonology, and a naive belief in immortality. These are certainly provocative charges.

This latest contribution of Freud stems directly from two previous works. In "Totem and Taboo" (1912) he had established the primacy of the father and the blood guilt associated with his slaying as the source of totemism and its religious overtones; and in "The Future of an Illusion" (1927) he had defined religion as essentially a racial neurotic symptom with obsessive characteristics. We have here another instance of the consistent development of Freud's thought: his final reckoning with religion in this book is an organic extension of previous trends.

Freud's contention that Moses was an Egyptian, a man of high rank, either a priest or a noble, seems incontestable. The proof from etymological sources is overwhelming. Variations of the name occur again and again in Egyptian hieroglyphs. Indeed, Freud finds it strange that nobody else should have drawn the obvious conclusion. He sees Moses as a disciple, possibly a posthumous follower, of Ikhnaton (Amenhotep), the enlightened Pharaoh of the Eighteenth Dynasty, who repudiated the worship of Amon and developed the cult of Aton. After the death of Ikhnaton, Moses turned to the backward and oppressed Jews and preached to them the doctrine that he had embraced from his master. With the Egyptians only too glad to see them on their way, the whole business of the miraculous crossing of the Red Sea, as Freud comments caustically, can be put down as a case of mock-heroic confabulation. He further asserts that circumcision, a rite unknown to the peoples east of Suez but customary with the Egyptians, was imposed upon the Jews by Moses as, so to speak, a way of earmarking them.

Freud uses a thesis advanced by Professor Ernst Sellin as basis for his belief that Moses was slain by a reactionary polytheistic priesthood after the refugees had joined the Jewish tribes left in Arabia, where the volcanic god Jahve had become ascendant, and possibly before the conquest of Canaan. It must be noted that Sellin, a brilliant authority on Bibical exegesis, is not widely supported in his reading of Hosea, although Professor Frederick Sturmer, of the University of Würzburg, accepted his thesis. Having taken this step, Freud assumes that there was a second, spurious Moses who may never have heard of his predecessor.

After these preliminaries Freud proceeds in characteristic fashion. He makes an assumption which is really a variation of the theory of the transmission of acquired characteristics —the reconstruction of the ontogenetic psyche according to the phylogenetic. "Peoples can be treated as we do the individual neurotic." And again, "The archaic heritage of mankind includes not only dispositions but also ideational contents, memory traces of the experiences of former generations."

Freud therefore, within the confines of his own logic, postulates a latency period for the Jewish race in which the memory of the slaying of Moses could for a long time remain unconscious. But the revived memory left them with a double guilt: the prehistoric, totemistic slaying of the primeval father, followed by the slaying of Moses. Freud regards Moses as one of the world's really great men, one who, like Ikhnaton, was a millennium or more ahead of his time. He postulates memory traces of him surviving predominantly in the writings of the inspired prophets of the Jewish race (including Jesus), who constantly reacted violently against the intrenched priesthood of their times and preached a spiritual religion of pure ethical content.

The book contains many other controversial points. Freud explains anti-Semitism as being based in part upon a real jealousy of the Jewish claim to monotheistic priority, as being in a way an acknowledgment, though a mistaken one, that the Jews had invented monotheism—of which they had never ceased to boast. He further asserts, somewhat paradoxically, that "hatred for Judaism is at bottom hatred for Christianity" and brings the point home to the German National Socialists, who were "badly [and belatedly] Christianized" and now have become "barbarically polytheistic" again under the aegis of Thor and Wotan.

Freud acknowledges many hesitancies in publishing his latest work for public as well as private reasons. For a time he thought of not publishing his discussion of monotheism at all. It was written at intervals in Vienna and London and contains many recapitulations. Thus the entire theory of the super-ego and of the return of the repressed is repeated, with emphasis upon original sin and salvation, which became the nucleus of the new religion created by St. Paul. These innovations made Christianity a Son instead of a Father religion, with the central emphasis upon Christ as the redeemer. Also, as if in anticipation of an attack upon Sellin's thesis of the slaying of Moses, Freud stands by his original theory as expressed in "Totem and Taboo," despite the many strictures made upon it, notably by Malinowski. He insists upon its psychological if not its factual truth, as a psychoanalyst rather than as an ethnologist.

The book is bound to make a deep impression and to have many profound repercussions. There is certainly irony in the thought that a Christian (?) Hitler, whom Freud would probably place beyond the pale of psychoanalytic aid, should violently deny that Christ could possibly have been a Jew, while Freud, a man brought up in the Israelite faith, should proclaim to all Jewry that their greatest leader was an Egyptian. And Freud, writing in his eighty-third year, seems finally to have settled scores with his apotheosized father by analyzing him out of existence. ALFRED B. KUTTNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Handbook on Air Power

BOMBS BURSTING IN AIR. THE INFLUENCE OF AIR POWER ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. By George Fielding Eliot. Reynal and Hitchcock. $1.75.

MAJOR ELIOT'S new book is hardly the aeronautical equivalent of Mahan that its subtitle suggests. It is no treatise, but rather a short—and if superficial still admirably clear—handbook on air power for the middle-class trade; reading time, one hour and forty-five minutes, or two trips on the commuters' special.

The first part of the book is devoted to satisfying the curiosity of the man in the street and his wife about what air power means to Europe. Assuming that war is coming, will Hitler gamble everything on silencing and demoralizing London? Major Eliot thinks so; the *Blitzkrieg* is the only strategy offering him victory—if he is ever forced to fight. To reduce London, Major Eliot calculates that he must send out from 600 to 1,200 planes a day for at least a week, constantly replacing those brought down by defensive planes.

Since, according to Major Eliot, Germany now has 4,000 planes in fighting squadrons, with an equal number in reserve, and is producing some 600 planes a month, its air strength would be equal to the astounding effort necessary for carrying out Hitler's threat to raid London every hour. But this effort would involve leaving German cities unguarded against counter-raids and draining all attack planes from the Siegfried line. As Major Eliot shows, this gamble that the English would collapse in a week—Hitler's variation of the 1914 Schlieffen plan, which assumed that the French could be crushed in short order—leaves the French army out of account. During the Munich crisis General Gamelin told his (uninterested and partly corrupt) government that he could take his army through the Siegfried line in four days, as though it were "marmalade." If Gamelin was not boasting, this is surely one reason why Hitler does not intend to oblige his enemies by getting into a general war.

In the second part of his book Major Eliot goes right to the root of the method Germany has preferred to the gamble of war. He can find no more appropriate word for this method than blackmail; and, as he shows, Chamberlain has effectively passed on this blackmail to his countrymen. Thanks to the German air threat, the Chamberlain government was able to say: "Fighting Hitler means of course that all you silly fools will get your heads blown open, if you aren't gassed first. But of course we'll lead you into it if that's what you want. Only wouldn't it be better to let Hitler take that funny little country out there that nobody wants but him?" Fighting Joe Kennedy recently said that only Jews and radicals in the United States oppose Chamberlain and appeasement. Major Eliot's book is bound to make Joe a liar in many people's minds. Its conclusion is that Chamberlain is no good.

Eliot turns to America in the latter part of his book. Here he discusses the special problem of a nation uniquely protected by thousands of miles of ocean from the horror of political blackmail and/or bombing that has hung over every European city since the gory days of March, 1938, in Barcelona. Our defense needs are entirely different from those of European nations, and the paramount weapon of our air force is the long-range four-engine bomber. These planes will cooperate with the navy to prevent any remote threat to our security from such bases as the Canary or the Cape Verde Islands—which, Major Eliot neglects to add, have already been handed over to Germany and Italy by the stupidity and/or treachery of our London-made policy toward Spain. In the Atlantic we can make ourselves impregnable by the use of advance bases like the one building at Puerto Rico, and in the Pacific Hawaii will serve a similar purpose. The Philippines are more a strategic liability than an asset. The Panama Canal should be fortified and have its locks doubled, and a new canal should be built through Nicaragua. This will make our sea communications shock proof. For the rest it is necessary only to build a wall of ships and planes that will repel any attack, and to stay out of Europe. Such is Major Eliot's defense program, and it is undoubtedly a popular one.

This book will not be read by the technical or military expert. It is not irrelevant or unfair, nevertheless, to question certain simplified technical statements on which its argument hangs. Thus Major Eliot clings to his previously published thesis that aircraft cannot be relied on to win battles independently of land or sea forces; his citation of the Barcelona horror is meant to show that the independent value of aircraft is mainly psychological. But he does not discuss the Battle of Guadalajara, in which the Loyalist air force, operating independently, sent the Italian army running over the hill. If it is true that aircraft, operating independently, can rout masses of land troops, the plans for any future war along Russia's European border—where great masses of men will necessarily be used—must be altered considerably. Major Eliot does not discuss this possibility. Indeed, one of the great gaps in his book is that it contributes nothing at all to the widespread popular desire for authentic information on the air power of Russia.

A debatable point is Eliot's assignment to the combined British, French, and Russian air fleets of a ratio of superiority over Germany of only two to one. Figures confidentially released by the War Department at the end of 1938, when Germany's relative position was superior to its present one, gave the anti-German forces a four-to-one superiority.

Another very serious omission, in a discussion of the security of the United States, is the lack of any mention of the direct relation of our export trade to axis armaments; Major Eliot's plea for United States rearmament fails to point out that it would be cheaper for us to stop arming the powers we must arm ourselves against. Similarly, he fails to analyze the contribution of American technology, as distinguished from materials and equipment, to the building of possible enemy war machines; and, in fact, his discussion of international air power is throughout superficial for its omission of technological comparisons between the various air powers. Major Eliot may feel that it is dangerous for a democracy to attempt to tamper with the freedom of its citizens engaged in foreign trade. But there is no sense in pretending that there would be any freedom left here if our security received even the suggestion of a threat. Frank regimentation of our foreign trade to forestall United States rearmament on what may eventually have to be a totalitarian scale would be the lesser evil.

ELIOT JANEWAY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Great Deflator

WALL STREET UNDER OATH. By Ferdinand Pecora. Simon and Schuster. $2.50.

IN "Wall Street Under Oath" Ferdinand Pecora writes of the investigation associated with his name. The inquiry, begun by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in January, 1933, two months before Mr. Roosevelt's inaugural, did much to shape the New Deal. The facts elicited during the seventeen months in which Pecora put most of our leading bankers on the griddle laid the basis for the Banking Act of 1933, the Truth-in-Securities Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission Act, and the Public Utility Holding Company Act. The list represents impressive achievement, but these statutory fruits of the investigation are overshadowed by its success as an instrument of democratic education. Like the other great Congressional inquiries that have played midwife to social reform, it turned the nation into a vast class in economics. The chief findings sank so throughly into the public consciousness as to make possible defeat of the high-pressure lobbies mobilized against regulation of the security markets. It was argued that supervision of the Exchange would dry up the market, but the ordinary citizen learned enough from the Pecora investigation to translate this argument into simpler terms: the bankers were threatening to stop shooting craps if they were forbidden to load the dice. "Far from being an impartial forum for the free play of supply and demand, as pictured by its authorities," Justice Pecora writes, "the Exchange was in reality neither more nor less than a glorified gambling casino where the odds were heavily weighted against the eager outsiders." If that be a truism, it was Pecora who made it so.

The Pecora investigation served another function. It helped destroy the prestige of our leading financiers and thus to weaken their power to fight the necessary economic and social reforms of the New Deal. The shrewd public-relations strategists of the right have recently been successful in muffling the impact of the present monopoly inquiry by raising the cry of "no witch hunting." The Pecora investigation, to take the invidious phrase by the horns, did witch hunt. It personalized issues. Its least tangible but perhaps most important result was the change it brought about in our national ideals. The financial stuffed shirts of the post-war decade, on whom the young men had hitherto sought to model themselves, underwent a Great Deflation of their own in Pecora's hearings. Mr. Wiggin had made four million dollars selling the stock of his own bank short between the first market break in September, 1929, and the final crash. Mr. Morgan had been able to "avoid" payment of any taxes during the black years when the less fortunate lost homes and farms under the sheriff's hammer. Mr. Mitchell's Brazilian bond expert reported the "complete ignorance, carelessness, and negligence" of the state authorities of Minas Geraes; Mr. Mitchell assured investors that "prudent and careful administration of the state's finances has been axiomatic with successive administrations in Minas Geraes," and sold them $16,500,000 of Minas Geraes bonds worth their weight in wallpaper. Mr. Insull's deft use of a device called the holding company had made it possible for him to manipulate and lose $2,500 of other people's money for every dollar invested of his own. The "preferred list," the most sensational of the Pecora revelations, dramatized the easy-money Elysium in which our upper classes dwelt and the imperial impartiality with which the House of Morgan distributed largess to politicians of either party. When the barrage against the New Deal began and the American Bankers' Association attacked guaranty of bank deposits as "unsound, unscientific, unjust, and dangerous," Pecora's pupils were ready with a Bronx cheer.

Justice Pecora ends upon a note of warning. "It is certainly well," he concludes, "that Wall Street now professes repentance. But it would be most unwise, nevertheless, to underestimate the strength of hostile elements. When open resistance fails, there is still the opportunity for traps, stratagems, intrigues, undermining—all the resources of guerrilla warfare. These laws are no panaceas; nor are they self-executing. More than ever we must maintain our vigilance." Perhaps we shall be more vigilant when Justice Pecora gives us the sequel this book demands, when he tells us what occurred behind the scenes and what has since happened to the legislation his inquiry fathered. How much of our progress is real, how much illusory? To what degree is the divorce of commercial banking from security affiliates a divorce of convenience? What of the "traps, stratagems, intrigues, undermining" which have occurred since the passage of our new banking and security legislation? In this connection one hopes the sequel to "Wall Street Under Oath" will exhibit less delicacy. Justice Pecora discusses the notorious commercial-alcohol pool of 1933, but fails to mention its most prominent participant, Joseph P. Kennedy; or the fact that the President by some fantastic intrigue was prevailed upon to pick, not Pecora, but that same speculator from Boston as first chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Perhaps some publisher can now persuade Justice Pecora really to tell all.

I. F. STONE

Shorter Notices

THE HORSE THAT COULD WHISTLE "DIXIE" AND OTHER STORIES. By Jerome Weidman. Simon and Schuster. $2.50.

Either you already know the anecdote about the musically gifted horse or you don't, but in either case you won't learn any more about it from reading Jerome ("I Can Get It for You Wholesale") Weidman's volume of stories. The title, which is unquestionably a honey as titles go, is attached to a sketch which appeared in the *New Yorker* a few months ago about a bellicose father who forced his reluctant little boy to ride one of the ten-cents-a-turn (non-whistling) ponies in Central Park. It happens to be one of the best stories in the book, clear-cut, single in its aim, pungently projecting its one scene and biting off the thread at the end with a grim snap. The chances are that it belongs to that group of stories which Mr. Weidman in his preface says were written to please himself rather than to conform to the whims of magazine editors The two stories that precede it, however—What Do You Know and All I Survey—must come from the second class, the pieces that were written to suit somebody else; and, as the author frankly admits, he does other people's work badly.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Most of the twenty-eight stories in the collection may be divided into two groups: the Lower East Side sketches and the stories about people who talk English with more regard for the rules, whatever sins they may commit against the rules of ethics or sportsmanship. On the whole, the first group, doubtless drawn from Mr. Weidman's own reminiscences, hit the mark much more squarely and consistently than the second, which often sound as if the author had started out simply with the determination to write a story that the average reader would consider hard-boiled. Vignettes like The Explorers or Dumb Kid or Old Clothes for Poland hit you with the impact of things seen and vividly recorded. Though there is a liberal sprinkling of the abysmally selfish, ruthless characters Mr. Weidman's novels would lead you to expect, the stories show a few gleams of sweetness and light. Some of the people, though small-souled, are at least "good-natured slobs," and a few even reveal a spark of poetry trying to spurt into flame against the soggy background of New York's human ant-heap.

WIND, SAND AND STARS. By Antoine de Saint Exupéry. Reynal and Hitchcock. $2.75.

Antoine de Saint Exupéry has little joy of his adventures; he is addicted to them. They have dragged him across the Andes, slapping his plane through hellish storms while he sought a comrade, and they have ground his mouth into the Libyan desert when thirst maddened him. They have brought the enchantment and the sovereignty of flying the mails by night in Africa and South America and France, but he has been filled with melancholy always, which "curiously resembled thirst." Whether he was saving the proscribed weaklings from the firing squads of Spain or buying slaves to free in Morocco, it was the pathetic nobility of man that moved him, the tragedy that in every man there should be "a bit of Mozart murdered." Like Conrad, Saint Exupéry is a philosophical adventurer for whom each incident forms the nucleus of a wonder and is universally significant. Rain, to him, is never water, but a cosmic lash. Pilots don't die; they "retire for Eternity." He never flies his plane higher, simply; he "tacks in the direction of Mercury." But for all this mysticism, this beating about the fact, his adventures are vital and his conclusions as clean as his admirably translated prose.

AMERICAN NEEDLEWORK. By Georgiana Brown Harbeson. Coward-McCann. $15.

Mrs. Harbeson has written a valuable book in a field where many of the links are still missing. She does not, for example, establish in factual terms the influence of the Moravian schools, which was probably important; perhaps she could not do so for lack of definite evidence. But there is scarcely an aspect of the long history of American stitchery which she does not touch upon or charmingly illustrate—the illustrations, some of them in color, are copious—and the sentimentalism which has sometimes invaded similar works is missing here. Her book will naturally be of interest to practitioners of all ranks, of whom there are surprisingly many, refusing the thesis that the leisured arts are gone. It will have much to say to those who, like Marguerite Zorach or Mrs. Harbeson herself, regard stitchery as a means of expression related to the art of painting. Still further, she has assembled with great insight and tact materials which may one day be worked into a comprehensive history of American design.

ART

American Art at the Fair

ANY detailed discussion of the 1,200 art works at the World's Fair contemporary American exhibition would be futile. The show must be viewed as a whole, as an attempted synthesis of present-day traditions and tendencies in our art and national culture. The "democratic" nature of the collection has already been emphasized by Holger Cahill in his introduction to the catalogue. Apparently each painting and piece of sculpture was "elected" to the walls like a state senator—with the accent on regional representation. The motive was to arrive at some definition of an American aesthetic, to render a more inclusive description of painting, sculpture, and the graphic arts in this country today. The result is an inglorious geographic compendium which violates all the boundaries of judgment and taste, although it follows most of the laws laid down by Baedeker.

We are represented from coast to coast in our art, from the Gulf to Canada and back again, yet nowhere do we come upon an affirmation of the American scene in terms of oils, color, patterns, shapes, design, composition, as aesthetically coherent or successful as the Fair itself. The reason for this failure is not to be ascribed to the artists but to the judges —it is assumed that Mr. Cahill is their spokesman—and their shockingly chauvinistic emphasis on specific national characteristics to the detriment of more generalized evaluations. Throughout Mr. Cahill's introduction, American Art Today is discussed as some local, isolated phenomenon, like thunder in Alaska—with even less reference to any universal experience. Mr. Cahill complements this point of view with the attitude that art in this country is still in its early formative stages, and consequently must be regarded indulgently as an element in our national education. Such qualities as *réportage,* environmental limitations, territorial differences, are to be taken into account in preference to more metaphysical factors. Under government patronage—which, it may be noted, originated not with prosperity but with depression: unemployment, the enforced bohemianism of the worker, and the inverted, freak professionalization of the bohemian—the artist has suddenly become a useful member of his community, has even raised its cultural standards. This circumstance, Mr. Cahill feels, should create new and apparently provincial criteria. We may pause here. It seems an obvious confusion to believe that because the artist has been provided with a counterfeit orientation to bourgeois society the technical problems of his media have altered or his work is to be accepted purely in terms of his wage-earning function in the community. Before the artist succeeds as a county gazetteer, he must first become—like Breughel—a gazetteer of humanity. This is his primary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

function, and it relates more particularly to interpretation than to documentation, more to a state of consciousness than to a geographical or economic state. Doubtless personal, social, and political conditions contribute to his general statement, but they neither dominate it nor eliminate it. Geography is the anatomy of the land, not its *esprit,* and impoverished as our American art heritage is, it would be difficult, offhand, to identify the work of Benjamin West, Ryder, Eakens, or Luks with place-names or purely local (city, country) customs. Yet each of these painters described an aspect of American culture or consciousness. Their idiom was as coherent as the idiom of David, Greco, Renoir, or Lautrec. But their provincialism—American civilization as compared with Europe—was translated into their *matière;* it never served to decorate a dialect.

The artist in American Art Today, despite his communal integration, is both a social and a creative victim. His work presents nothing more than canceled tidbits of aesthetic slang. His contribution is made not in a universal idiom but in a patois which balks translation. Communication is limited; often to express himself he is reduced to the imitation and parody of a foreign tongue. It may seem folly to attribute this deficiency to the judges of the exhibition, but it must be remembered that they set out to discover the denominator to American imagination and consciousness, and accomplished little more than a foot tour of the forty-eight states; that an insistent emphasis on specialized national criteria is the next best thing to fascist censorship of art; that none of the breadth, vigor, or creative originality of the Fair itself is to be found either in the show as a whole or in any one of the 1,200 representations; and that, finally, if the American psyche is banal, gross, or provincial, those are the qualities to be sought and metamorphosed in its art rather than the compensatory facts of geographic and cultural insulation.

It may be mistakenly assumed from what has been said that the exhibition consists of a series of literal reproductions of the American scene, from the Battery to Yosemite Valley. On the contrary, even this type of coordination and consistency is lacking. Heterogeneity is the keynote, and every school of contemporary painting is represented, the modern, academic, surrealist, neo-romantic, abstract, and propagandist, all apparently neatly trimmed to the artist's newly achieved orientation. Here and there one comes upon a painter whose virtuosity and competence are gratifying, but his contribution, more likely than not, is completely adumbrated by its surroundings, overhung with everything but trapezes. Max Weber, who is certainly nobody's discovery, offers an excellent study in figure grouping and tonal architecture, an oil, Seeking Work; Stuart Davis leads off the abstract group with Gloucester Harbor, employing a technique which suggests *pointilliste* abbreviation; Hopper, Kuniyoshi, Reginald Marsh, Niles Spencer, all present recognizable examples of familiar styles. For those who enjoy the pursuit of needles in haystacks, the following may be recommended: J. Billington, Henry Botkin, Peter Busa, G. Driscoll, Briggs Dyer, Doris Lee, Jack Levine, James Lechay, Douglas Brown, George Morris, and Joseph Solman.

Of the 25,000 works submitted, one wonders how these few acceptable contributions and even fewer pieces of sculpture constitute a characteristic American cultural assertion or form "an integral part of modern civilization." Mr. Whalen, with the unimpeachable wisdom of a child, was right from the very beginning: the Fair would be art, there would be no need for an exhibition of fine arts. And he proceeded to create a five-and-ten-cent-store Xanadu out of the swamplands. Mr. Cahill and his associates, unfortunately, inverted the process.

CHRISTOPHER LAZARE

FILMS

ENJOYING Elisabeth Bergner in her newest picture "Stolen Life" (Paramount release) I celebrated a sentimental anniversary which, I hope, did not rob me of the mythical objectivity of the critic. It is exactly twenty-five years since Liesl, as we called her, made her first public appearance in Vienna. The occasion was the annual dramatic performance of the high school where I was a pupil. Now Michael Redgrave has replaced me as her partner, and, to get it over with, I hasten to admit that he is excellent. I also have to confess that I followed Liesl more attentively than anything else in the picture.

The script, after a light Czech novel, tells the strange story of two young and exceedingly charming sisters who look alike but are not alike. Martina is a precious soul, Sylvina a flirt. It is not difficult to understand why the inexperienced, robust mountain climber switched to the more directly appealing type. The melodramatic tricks which follow I will not give away—the attempt of the gentle Martina to live the life of her successful sister, after her death, becomes the central theme. Many observations could be made on why a great actress has to play in such tricky stories, but I will not concern myself now with this question, which involves both box-office misconceptions and the lack of adequate manuscripts. I am still under the spell of a *Wiedersehen* with the girl of twenty-five years ago. Since I am interested more in her personality than in the vehicles she chooses for expressing herself, the criticism that in the double part of Martina and Sylvina she remains always Elisabeth Bergner is meaningless to me.

And not only for that reason. There are two different types of actress. One type brings a part to life; the other uses a part to come alive herself. Both are legitimate techniques. Elisabeth Bergner belongs in the second category, those whom one might call autobiographical players. They become important, and distinguished from mere exhibitionists, if their personalities are worth while. Most stage and screen artists are, of course, mixed types. Elisabeth Bergner, however, seems to be as purely autobiographical a player as can be imagined. Her means of expression have developed since 1914, but their theme remains the same—the torn soul of Liesl.

The plot of "Stolen Life" is too crude and obvious for the presentation of a dual personality. And the actress's often criticized "mannerisms"—her method of holding the opposing forces in herself together only to separate them in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this picture—are sometimes insufficient to conceal technical limitations. Many people, too, prefer straighter and healthier performances; they are even annoyed by too subtle nuances, which merely complicate further for them a reality that is complicated enough. Especially many men resent the complexity of a superior woman. Elisabeth Bergner displays it again and again uncompromisingly. Often she may not achieve her end, the full expression of the conflict in the character of Elisabeth Bergner; but watch attentively little scenes like the one in which Martina stops her aunt's attempt to tell her that she must fight the sister who has lured her lover away. See how she does it, pianissimo, with a minimum of effort, conveying in one second the whole depth of her love, and you will experience a rare, unforgettable moment of perfection.

An artist of the other type is Ralph Richardson, whom we saw last in "The Citadel" as Denny. In "Clouds Over Europe" (Columbia), an English-American production of a good deal of merit, he creates the character of an amiable secret-service agent, Major Hammond. The picture often achieves the excellence of suspense and characterization of the best thriller of the past season, Hitchcock's "The Lady Vanishes," but it is Ralph Richardson who steals the show with his precise, witty, and unforced presentation of a personality quite different from his own. It is easy to predict that Major Hammond will appear again and again. The club of movie detectives will have a new permanent member. Special mention must be made of the expert direction of Tom Whelan, who hits the mark in every scene.

This was a good week: it gave me the chance to see again an old friend who, criticism aside, becomes more beautiful in every picture and to gain a new one—Major Hammond.

FRANZ HOELLERING

RECORDS

GIESEKING, who has hitherto made records only in England and Germany, recently made some in this country; and a group of them head Columbia's June list. The extraordinary delicacy, sensitiveness, and precision that distinguish his playing are in the performances, on a single record ($1), of Debussy's early and undistinguished "Rêverie," which Larry Clinton has made famous, and a transcription of Strauss's "Ständchen," which is better heard in its original form sung by Elisabeth Schumann. The incisiveness and suppleness of rhythm, the verve, the rich tonal coloring contribute to a superb performance, on another single ($1), of Ravel's "Alborado del gracioso," a piece with little content but much Spanish style and piano glitter. And all these qualities combine to produce a performance of Beethoven's Sonata Opus 57 ("Appassionata") (three records, $5) that is swift, exciting, truly passionate, and lacking only the breadth and rugged power which the work should have. Even without this, however, it is a better performance than Fischer's, and therefore the best now available outside of Schnabel's in H. M. V.'s subscription set. Recording is excellent.

LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

In each of Chopin's Etudes a different piano figuration is exploited; and this provides the terms in which Chopin creates a piece of music as exquisitely thought and formed and finished as any other. The best performances, then, are those in which a sensitive musicianship operates with the complete freedom provided by a technique that disposes of the figuration with unobtrusive ease—those of Bachaus, for example, in his early Victor set. In Kilenyi's performances of Opus 10, excellently recorded in a Columbia set (three records, $5), one is more aware of figuration brilliantly played than of musical pattern outlined with good and sometimes with sensitive musical taste. They are not, then, the best, but they are very good, infinitely better than Cortot's, and therefore the ones to buy if you want modern recording.

Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert exhibit powers that are among the greatest we know of, but not in a run-of-the-mill exercise of craftsmanship like Mozart's Violin Sonata K. 454 (two records, $3.50), well played by Denise Soriano and Magda Tagliaferro, nor in a potboiler like Beethoven's Eleven Viennese Dances (two records, $3.50), also well played by the London Philharmonic under Weingartner, nor in a prim little copy of eighteenth-century models like Schubert's Symphony No. 5 (four records, $6), on which Beecham lavishes superb playing by the London Philharmonic that would better have been devoted to the great Symphony in C. As for the Cante Flamenco sung on two records (75 cents each) by La Niña de los Peines, it sounds like the real thing; but the real thing, I must add, includes not only La Niña's style but her far from agreeable voice.

B. H. HAGGIN

To Subscribe to *The Nation* just fill out and mail this form

THE NATION
55 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

For the inclosed $..... please enter my subscription for the period indicated below:

☐ TEN WEEKS ($1)
☐ ONE YEAR ($5)
☐ TWO YEARS ($8)
☐ THREE YEARS ($11)

Name.....
Street.....
City.....
State.....

7-1-39

Extra postage per year: Foreign $1; Canadian 50c

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

Objective, Not Partisan

Dear Sirs: Discussing the merger of the Akron *Times-Press* with the Beacon *Journal,* Robert Bendiner and James Wechsler in the May 13 issue of *The Nation* said: "Morrow was the champion of the swift-rising union movement in Akron and an ardent defender of the New Deal."

Thus objective and fair journalism has been mistaken by historians of the labor movement for partisan journalism. It is a mistake that labor leaders never made. They were satisfied with fairness and formed no pressure groups to get more. A few industrialists construed objective fairness as labor bias, but there was always a larger, more important, and pragmatic group that understood.

The *Times-Press* was the first newspaper in America to condemn sitdown strikes. It never hesitated to attack anything offside that labor did. It supported injunctions when granted fairly after a proper hearing. On the other hand, it attacked vigilante movements and decried the formation of any group for the purpose of suppressing or coercing labor. It just as readily condemned employers when they stalled and tried to wait for a Supreme Court decision before recognizing and obeying the Wagner Act. All this involved a well thought-out and pursued philosophy of journalism. It was simply this: An editor best serves democracy when he functions in his community as an integrator, striving always to harmonize warring elements into movements that bring a united front in seeking the common good.

This is accomplished most easily when the editor runs his news columns on the ruggedly honest principle of telling what goes on. This takes more courage than bias does, because the partisan always has his supporters to give him encouragement. It has been my experience that newspapers cannot settle labor controversies, and that the editor is most useful when he hews to the objective news line and contents himself editorially with pointing out deviations from fair play by either side and demanding that they stop. The public is always quick to perceive these deviations when they are pointed out, and pressure goes on against the side that has erred.

The idea that I, as editor of the *Times-Press,* was a champion of a movement or a philosophy of a class nature does violence to my attitude of professional and philosophical detachment. It implies a bias that did not exist and obscures whatever adroitness I may have shown in handling a difficult problem.

In fairness it should be said that I had at all times the warm-hearted support of the Scripps-Howard general management in my efforts to run a newspaper in the best democratic tradition. It is also true that there was a great deal of friendly rivalry between John Knight, publisher of the Beacon *Journal,* and myself in seeing who best could do the job of being fair and objective.

WALTER MORROW

Columbus, Ohio, June 21

Knox Gelatine Research

Dear Sirs: In the April 29 issue of your publication Helen Woodward discussed the scientific information that has been released recently on the use of gelatine for increasing muscular endurance. Because she made several inferences and statements that are not correct I am taking the liberty of writing you this letter.

In the first place, the work is not in the field of "patent medicine," as she puts it, but in the legitimate field of scientific research. Plain, unflavored gelatine does not claim to be a medicine but a beneficial food.

Glycine therapy is a controversial subject, and one from which pseudo-scientists should stay clear. The scientists who conducted this research are not at all inclined to credit Knox Gelatine's glycine content alone for the observed effect on muscular-energy output. Argenine and glutamic acid receive equal credit as precursor material for muscular creatine. Knox Gelatine contains ample amounts of both of these amino acids, and it is therefore entirely ridiculous for Mrs. Woodward's informant to throw the weight of observed effectiveness on the shoulders of glycine alone.

Mrs. Woodward seems to doubt that "glycine either as a medicine or in gelatine gives you muscular energy." Accepted proof of the fact that this treatment has not only given increased muscular endurance to the normal healthy person but also benefited the person suffering from muscular diseases may be found in medical literature. An account of the recent research was published in the Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, a journal of no small repute. However, the Knox Gelatine Company has not advocated that persons suffering from muscular diseases take this treatment. Such recommendation should come from their physician.

Mrs. Woodward seems to feel that one ounce of gelatine a day might cause the person taking it to develop any one of a long list of diseases caused by consumption of excessive amounts of protein. Since the average adult should consume at least four to five ounces of pure protein daily, it does not seem probable that one-half ounce of gelatine, which is the usual amount taken after the preliminary period, could upset the normal protein metabolism. Also a pure, plain, unflavored gelatine is accepted by medical and nutritional authorities as one of the most easily digested proteins for the human body.

She also remarks that gelatine swells in water, and her inference is that the required quantity might swell to such proportions as to do injury to the stomach. Gelatine does swell in cold water, and so do bread, crackers, and any one of a hundred other food products, but plain, unflavored gelatine dissolves completely at body temperature. Therefore the gelatine dissolves as soon as it reaches the stomach instead of staying in granulated form.

Again we answer Mrs. Woodward's question, "What about the people with too little gastric secretion?" by stating that persons suffering from this lack are dangerously ill and should be under the care of a physician. Since this ailment is an extremely painful one, persons suffering from it are not apt to be unaware of their condition.

Mrs. Woodward errs when she says that diabetics should not use gelatine because they will be adding to their total carbohydrate allowance. Plain, unflavored gelatine *does not* contain any carbohydrate. As a matter of fact, plain, unflavored gelatine is one of the foods frequently used by doctors in diabetic diets to introduce variety into the menu and also to increase the bulk of food and satisfy the hunger of the patient.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On one point alone do we find ourselves in full accord with Mrs. Woodward and that is her statement that we obtain phosphoric acid, glycine, and creatine from the food we eat. However, an ordinary diet will not supply "extra" amounts of muscular energy; to get these from food such huge quantities of meat would have to be consumed that the price might be such well-known clinical conditions as gout, kidney diseases, etc. We may add that creatine is not contained in the food we eat, but has to be synthesized from amino acids contained in foodstuffs.

Mrs. Woodward remarked, "It is yet to be substantiated that to be effective as a muscle energizer, gelatine has to be taken unflavored and unsweetened." Since she stated in the first part of her article that the amount of gelatine prescribed for this purpose would be difficult to take, wouldn't she certainly object to taking the amount of flavored and sweetened gelatine necessary to obtain the desired results? Since a package of the latter contains only about 10 per cent gelatine—the rest is sugar, flavoring, and coloring matter—she would have to take about thirteen boxes of the sweetened and flavored gelatine daily. And even I would think that a bit too much to get down.

J. E. KNOX, General Manager

Johnstown, N. Y., June 2

And Knox Advertising

Dear Sirs: I didn't say that Knox Gelatine research was in the field of "patent medicine," but that its advertising methods "have a patent-medicine sound." Of course gelatine contains other constituents besides glycine, but it is the glycine that is of the greatest importance, both on account of its high percentage and because it is involved in the formation of creatine, as has been experimentally established. "Creatine," says Mr. Knox, "is not contained in the food we eat." This statement is distinctly incorrect. Perhaps Mr. Knox meant to say creatinine, which is a metabolic waste product of creatine. Creatine itself occurs regularly in all muscle tissue; and, indeed, the building up of this substance in muscle from glycine is the basis of Knox Gelatine's whole campaign.

As for the effect of gelatine in quantity on the digestion, gelatine forms a hydrophilic solution like any other protein. I did not say that to take an ounce a day might result in "a long list of diseases." I said that too much of it might make you uncomfortable, and I repeat it. Just because a substance is a food doesn't mean that it's a good thing to take in large quantities.

Of course there's no carbohydrate in unflavored gelatine. However, every protein taken in excess of the body's maintenance needs and used in energy metabolism has to be transformed to carbohydrate before it is burned. So doctors figure 60 per cent of the protein allowance as carbohydrate. Most of the protein we take that we don't need is turned to carbohydrate. Where's the chemist who doesn't know this simple fact?

People with too little gastric secretion are as a rule not dangerously ill. Few of them go to doctors. But if they ought to do so, then certainly people who haven't enough energy should see a doctor instead of dosing themselves with Knox Gelatine or glycine or anything else.

My cook uses Knox Gelatine because I like it. But it is not a medicine, and to have its advertising read as if it were is risky and ridiculous.

HELEN WOODWARD

New York, June 14

Protest from Miss Block

Dear Sirs: Only the utmost provocation could induce me to protest against the complete misrepresentation of my book "The Changing World in Plays and Theater" in the review by Robert Vambery in your issue of May 20.

When Mr. Vambery, after quoting my definition of a vital theater as one which deals with matters that are essential to life in any given epoch, states that I never say what is essential to life in our time, he is simply not telling the truth, for, as all other reviewers have agreed, the importance of my book, in the words of John Haynes Holmes, for example, "lies in its critical studies of the outstanding plays of recent years in terms of the thought and life of this stirring age."

How on earth would it be possible for anyone, even if he had not my underlying social point of view, to discuss the works of Ibsen, Hauptmann, Shaw, Chekhov, Toller, Bourdet, Maugham, Lawson, O'Neill, Wexley, Odets, Hellman, and a host of others and not tell what is essential to life in our own time?

Again when Mr. Vambery states that I do not like the theater because I "apply" to it words like "spurious," "paltry," "ephemeral," and "futile," he is again not telling the truth. Nowhere in my book are such words applied to the theater *as such* but only to certain aspects of the theater which I deplore.

"The Changing World in Plays and Theater" has been hailed as of greatest value *to the theater* by such persons as Barrett Clark, Gilmor Brown, Harold Clurman, George Middleton, Ferdinand Bruckner, and others too numerous to mention here. Is it likely that all these men of standing in the theater are wrong in their enthusiastic commendation of my book and that Mr. Vambery alone is right in his incredible misrepresentation of it?

ANITA BLOCK

New York, June 12

Reply from Mr. Vambery

Dear Sirs: Miss Block charges me with misrepresentation in two instances. Neither of them affects the main argument of my review, and so "complete misrepresentation" seems a bit of an overstatement. Nevertheless, this is a very serious charge.

As to the first instance, it is obvious from Miss Block's letter that she has not understood this part of my review. She should read it again as I cannot repeat here the whole passage. Briefly, what I said was that Miss Block has given her definition a narrow-minded interpretation. Her august "what is essential to life" means simply "what I take to be essential to life," and so the sentence should read: "A vital theater is one which deals with matters that Miss Block deems to be essential to life." It is really amusing how utterly unable she is to realize that others may regard entirely different things as essential. Consequently her judgment of what is and what is not "vital theater" is merely a matter of personal preference. Miss Block should have written a book called, "My Years in the Theater" or something like that, and all would be well.

As to the second, let me quote Miss Block. On page 3 of her book she says: "entranced by the often *spurious trappings* of the theater *such as clever acting, smart dialogue, dazzling costumes and effective scenery . . .*"; on page 239: "we have with infrequent exceptions a theater cluttered with the *paltry* and the *futile.*" "The theater-of-the-armchair" stands on page 2, and on page 4 we find "plays which . . . *transcend ephemeral theater* and are worthy to live on as dramatic literature."

Miss Block "deplores" clever acting, smart dialogue, dazzling costumes, and effective scenery, but she likes the theater. Those "certain aspects" which she

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

professes to deplore are an integral part of the theater, and if she dislikes them, well, then, she dislikes the theater, and that is just what I said. What she likes is something which does not exist, which never existed, and of which there is no indication in the history of the theater that it ever will exist. Let me shock Miss Block. The theater *is* ephemeral. And this is exactly why it has retained the affection of mankind down the centuries. Puritans who would reform the playhouses only succeed in closing them. Roundheads and blockheads who would build a brave new stage could only succeed in engendering the Dark Ages of the Theater.

I am also charged with differing from other critics. This of course is no charge at all. I could call my own witnesses who are in agreement with my condemnation of Miss Block's tenets. Good names too, from Aristotle to J. W. Krutch, from Dryden to W. S. Maugham. But I won't. An old rebel who seeks refuge in authority is a charming sight, and it should be enjoyed without comment. ROBERT VAMBERY

New York, June 14

Harriet Tubman, Abolitionist

Dear Sirs: I am writing the biography of Harriet Tubman, the Negro woman abolitionist who was so widely known as a leader of the "underground railway," and am anxious to acquire any information about her life, particularly about her service in the war. She was born in Dorchester County, Maryland, about 1820, and died in Auburn, New York, in 1913. She served at Hilton Head, South Carolina, in Virginia, and elsewhere, and was widely praised by officers of the Northern army. She was also active as a feminist, and I should like to hear from suffragists who may recall her participation in their activities. Please address me at 316 West Ninety-third Street, New York.

New York, June 1 EARL CONRAD

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price, 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, 50 cents. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Dramatic Index, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs Information Service. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

CONTRIBUTORS

ALEXANDER WERTH is Paris correspondent of the Manchester *Guardian* and the author of "Which Way France?"

ROBERT DELL is known as the dean of foreign correspondents at Geneva. He frequently reports to *The Nation* on political developments in Europe.

JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES II is on the editorial staff of the Birmingham *Age-Herald* and author of "Tonight in the South."

CHARLES R. WALKER is making a movie for United States Films.

ALFRED B. KUTTNER was among the first popularizers of Sigmund Freud. As a literary assistant to Dr. A. A. Brill he has kept abreast with the development of psychoanalysis and in his writing has emphasized its cultural applications.

ELIOT JANEWAY is connected editorially with *Time*.

TRAVEL

IT IS EASY AND SIMPLE TO OBTAIN A SOVIET VISA

AMALGAMATED BANK

is organizing again a tour to

U. S. S. R.

under the auspices of

DR. EDWARD COHEN

August 5th on the modern

S.S. Batory

$286.00 round trip 3rd class

Place your application immediately

For further information call or write to

AMALGAMATED BANK

11-15 UNION SQ. NEW YORK, N. Y.

ALgonquin 4-1500

Non-driver wishes share expense trip to the West. July-August. Write Box 1156, c/o The Nation.

Couple, new car, vacationing economically, desire gentleman driver. We pay gasoline. Seligson, REgent 4-3011.

SITUATION WANTED

Free services offered by able secretary, "brushing up." Box 1154, c/o The Nation.

SCHOOL

Training course in social action, New School for Social Research, New York City, beginning October 1st. Full-time training in established agencies for techniques of Social action as distinguished from social work. Direction of Roger N. Baldwin. Apply New School, 66 West 12th St., N. Y.

COOPERATIVE COLONY

A Home in the Country within Your Means

125 Acres of Breathtaking Beauty on Barger Lake, Shrub Oak, N. Y.

A Non-profit Cooperative Colony — Membership costing $300 entitles you to build your cabin or bungalow on attractive site and to use all camp facilities.

Details and Descriptive Prospectus from Barger Cooperative Society, 6 E. 17 St., N. Y. C.

SUMMER RENTALS

Westport, Conn. Stonybrook Colony. Cool, comfortable furnished bungalows; modern kitchen and bath, 3 bedrooms, large porch, living room, fine lawns, flowers, private road. On premises swimming, tennis, handball, children's progressive groups. Pleasant commuting. $450 till end September; Hillborn, Westport 6151 or weekdays AL 4-9779.

Bungalows, 2 rooms, kitchenette, adult activities, children's camp life. $150. Boarding, $15 a week. 40 miles from N. Y. MOtt Haven 9-9553, afternoons.

Primrose Farm, New City, N. Y. Furnished housekeeping studios, 69 acres, accommodating few people. Open plumbing, electricity; easy commuting.

On Lake Hopatcong, upper half of Duplex Bungalow. 3 rooms. All modern improvements. Only one left. Real Bargain. $195. Mr. Asen, telephones: Hopatcong 394—Cumberland 6-0894—SLocum 6-9383.

Attractive rooms with or without housekeeping privileges; farm in beautiful Leigh Valley; 100 miles from New York; modern improvements; swimming, sunbathing. Fresh garden, dairy products on premises. Very Reasonable. Write: Plover Pond Orchards, Route 2, Coopersburg, Pa.

APARTMENT TO SHARE

Young woman, Jewish, will share 2½-room attractively furnished apartment; near Prospect Park. Call INgersoll 2-9371.

CHILDREN'S CAMP

SMILING HILLS CAMP

CARMEL, NEW YORK (New Lake Carmel, Rt. 52)

A progressive Camp for boys and girls from four to fourteen years of age.

Write or phone for information:

JAMES & NELLIE DICK

Camp phone: Carmel 334.

ROOMS FOR RENT

Week or season, large airy rooms, newly decorated and furnished facing ocean. Royal Plaza Hotel, Broadway and Lafayette, Long Beach. Phone Long Beach 1968.

411 W. 114 St. Large, attractive front room, southern exposure, within half block Columbia University. King, UN 4-5783.

FURNISHED STUDIO

Exceptionally large; Hudson breezes; artistically furnished; private bath; maid; Steinway; telephone; central location; complete privacy; quiet. SU 7-9880.

WANTED

Young person with car and typewriter, willing to donate three months' secretarial work and pay own expenses. Berkshires. Brotherhood of Man. Box 1155, c/o The Nation.

LISLE HOSIERY

Lisle mesh and plain stockings, union made. at wholesale prices. Eastern Hoisery Co., 330 Fifth Ave. (Suite 1402), N. Y. C.

APARTMENTS TO SUBLET

Modern 3 rooms, dinette, Steinway; 20-story bldg., cool, midtown. July-August, moderate rental. Box 1153, c/o The Nation or LO 5-8384, Apt. 2J, weekdays 5-6; Sat., Sun.; 9-12 A. M.

127 W. 96 St. Sublet July and August. Duplex apartment, 5 large nicely furnished, light rooms in modern, elevator building. References. Phone RI 9-0899, Walsh.

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED